DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 322 SP 012 285

AUTHOR Grumet, Madeleine R.
TITLE Supervision and Situation: A Methodology of Self-Report for Teacher Education.
PUB DATE 28 Mar 78
NOTE 78p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 27-31, 1978)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$4.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Autobiographies; Case Studies (Education); Communication (Thought Transfer); *Methods Research; Research Utilization; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS *Currere Method

ABSTRACT

This paper describes "currere", a method of critical reflection upon educational experience devised by William Pinar and Madeleine Grumet. In teacher education, this autobiographical method is employed to reveal how the classroom situation is determined by the kinds of questions asked of it. The methodology is related to dominant themes in supervision literature and teacher effectiveness research and to definitions of situation drawn from phenomenology and existential philosophy. Application of this method is demonstrated in writings of teachers with whom it has been used. Contributions of this methodology to techniques of ethnographic and qualitative research and to the training, supervision, and retraining of teachers are discussed. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Session # 9.23

ED151322

SUPERVISION AND SITUATION: A Methodology of Self-Report for Teacher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Madeleine R. Grumet
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND THE ERIC SYSTEM CONTRACTORS"

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Madeleine R. Grumet

State University College of Arts and Science
at Geneseo,
New York

Presented to the American Educational Research Association, Division C., Toronto, Ontario, Canada. March 28, 1978.

SP012285

I. SITUATION

Supervise - in medieval Latin it meant to peruse, or to scan a text. Imagine the monk performing this task, inspecting the text for errors, for minute deviations from an original manuscript that has been copied, perhaps even illuminated. What does this supervisor look for? Smudges? Omissions? Does he bend to the work, eying each word and disregarding the meaning of the aggregate as the skilled copy reader who trains himself to examine surface content only? Are his standards for the work shared by the one who executed it, both participating in a practice so saturated with their common faith that the criteria for scrutiny need scarcely be uttered?

Perhaps this backward glance idealizes the past, imagining the supervisor of medieval manuscripts to be free of the ambiguity, role conflicts and problems of interpretation that the task of supervision implies in our time. Perhaps even then, when the object of scrutiny was established liturgy, there were issues of style, design, interpretation and intent to be negotiated. Even if this retrospective view tends to simplify what it sees by receiving the completed artefact as given and forgetting the turmoil and doubt that may have accompanied its creation. I think that we can safely assume that today's supervisor of teaching practice faces his situation with less faith in his theory and less authority among his peers than did his medieval namesake.

What is common to both acts of supervision is a form of inquiry

that asks questions of actual, practical behavior. Our commonsense notion of the practical permits us to approach it with confidence, reassured by its familiarity. We label it "reality" and expect its contingencies and laws to reveal themselves as certainties that will determine our behavior. Nevertheless, closer inspection reveals the "practical" to be dependent upon our expectations and the questions we ask of it for its quality and value, and consequently, to study the practical is also to study the ways in which we contribute to what we see when we look. This study of supervision will examine the kinds of questions that supervisors ask of classroom events in order to demonstrate the relation between the questions asked and the answers received.

Unlike the supervisor of medieval manuscripts, the supervisor of teaching practice must first identify the field of his concern. While the phrase, learning environment, is often employed to represent the field in which teachers and students act, it is important that we realize that the terms "environment" and "situation" are not synonomous. The former describes the field before it is transfigured by human intention into a field for action. It is the field as described by a detached observer. Situation, on the other hand, places the human actor at its center. Its horizons are strung at the outer edge of his concerns, its interpretation is lodged within his perception; thus, its meaning is a construct of history and imagination.

This human situation is circumscribed by what Merleau-Ponty has called an "intentional arc" that radiates from the existential reality of a particular human individual. It is this intentional arc that "projects around us our future, our human setting, our physical and ideological and moral situation, or rather which results in our being situated in all these respects." (Merleau-Ponty, 1962). Merleau-Ponty's analysis of intentionality reminds us that we must look before we see without reducing looking to an act of pure subjectivity. How we look and what we see are contingent upon the facticity we encounter, the habits we have acquired through the deposits of past experience, the conventions of the socio-cultural setting in which we live as well as the possibilities of sensation and action provided by our bodies. It is the achievement and frustration of Merleau-Ponty's philosophy that a discussion of any one point of human experience in the world inevitably slides into a consideration of all the others. Situation slides into an infinite regression of contexts, and in identifying the field in which persons act, the ground we stand on seems to disappear beneath our feet.

Those who aspire to identify the situation that is the ground, however treacherous, for teaching acts confront the task of mapping the territory which they intend to explore. Sergiovanni and Starrat (1971) maintain that supervision takes place within a human system and that the supervisor's behavior is in some degree an expression of that system. Accordingly these writers, (along with

Lewis and Miel, 1972) examine the organizational structure of schools, hoping to indicate the kind of structure that will support the innovative and self-actualizing activity of teachers, supervisors, and students. Their approach, which requires placing the supervisory setting within its relevant contexts, presents us with a nest of Russian dolls. The classroom is embedded in the school, the school in the local system, the system in the values and interest of a particular community, the community in a nation, the nation in an economic and religious tradition, and so on. [1]

Rather than emphasizing the larger social structures in which the school is embedded, Basil Bernstein's analysis of school structure examines the bonds between social organization and the classification and framing of knowledge. It focuses upon the strength of ideology in traditional and open school settings and upon the channels and conditions for innovative activity provided in each structure.

While these organizational and structural analyses are useful to us as they reveal the contingencies that accompany action in school settings, they are heuristics that are more pertinent to the observer, than they are to the actor. These descriptive and theoretical models of situation are experienced most intimately by their describers and theoreticians, for whom observation and description function as modes of personal action. The generalizations that they employ are abstracted from concrete action and follow on the heels of lived experience. They overwhelm those of us who must choose and act in a situation strewn with detail and doubt

with superstructures which throw their shadows over the wishes and choices that prompt the actions of our daily living. Like mere mortals, crawling around the feet of our gods, we are intimidated by their power, located always beyond the scope of our own activity.

I have never met anyone who deliberately set out to create a bureaucracy. Indeed, I suspect that everyone who designs a social organization conceives of his plan as fertile ground for creative and synergistic human interaction. And yet I question whether we really go around experiencing bureaucratic or synergistic organizations as we meet and negotiate on our common ground. Someone answers his phone or doesn't. I serve on one committee because I owe its chairperson a favor and withdraw from another because it never gets anything done and conflicts with my dental appointments. I answer your memo with my memo, or I knock on your door, and you offer me a cup of tea. Social organizations derive much of their normative power from the language we use to describe them. The language grows large and fat, devouring the complexity and ambiguity of the interactions it describes, and then we complain that it encumbers us and use its bulk as a ploy to rationalize our own passivity.

In an attempt to present situation as a field for action rather than observation, Robert Goldhammer (1969) employs the term "clinical". Applied to supervision, it means "supervision up close" and focuses upon the close relationship of the supervisor and the teacher. They are close because they are not merely working on committees where

there is talk about schooling, nor are they studying curriculum that represents classroom interaction, but are face to face in the actual classroom, where the action is. Similarly, Morris Cogan employs the term "clinical" to emphasize "classroom observation, the analysis of in-class events, and the focus on teacher' and students' in-class behavior." (1973 p. 9) Both writers see supervision as field centered work that addresses the actions of particular persons in a particular place at a particular time. In sympathy with Goldhammer and Cogan, I too prefer to address the situation of supervision as the one that is revealed in the dialogue of supervisors and teachers as they meet in the classroom. This discourse grows from the questions that each brings to this situation. First are the questions that dominate the theory that the supervisor brings to her intrepretation of classroom events. Second are the questions that the supervisor and the teacher ask of their relationship, questions that determine the nature of the topics they will discuss, and the authority, trust and initiative that each will express in communication with the other. Third are the questions that the individual teacher asks of his or her daily work. It is difficult to speak of these questions in isolation from one another, for they are all present whenever the activity of teachers is analyzed and discussed. Each question must be seen as not only addressing a concrete situation, but as helping to determine that very situation itself. Because the asking of a question transfigures

a neutral field into a situation that provides an answer, many supervisors and researchers are looking at the questions they ask in order to better understand the ways in which they shape the answers they receive.

The Theorist's Questions

Walter Doyle's comprehensive analysis of teacher-effectiveness research offers critical appraisal of the theory that the supervisor brings with him to the classroom. (1978) His study rests upon the assumption that the questions one asks defines the field from which answers are drawn. Doyle identifies three major paradigms, process-product, mediating-process, and classroom ecology, that support this research and examines the conception of the classroom situation implicit in each.

The process/product paradigm, the most prevalent of the three, asks "how do low-inference teacher behaviors effect student learning outcomes?" Because this paradigm rests upon a stimulus-response model, addressing discrete teacher behaviors and a narrow definition of outcome variables, Doyle argues that this approach largely ignores the classroom milieu and reduces it to a distracting and and irritating set of intervening variables. The process/product paradigm's assumption that teaching behavior is the independent variable and student response the dependent variable neglects to consider those teacher behaviors that are themselves a response to the stimulus provided by the behavior of students.

The process/product paradigm addresses a mechanistic situation

and not a human one. It presents a situation stripped of the intent of the actors, teachers or students. It narrowly prescribes the kinds of questions and the kinds of answers it will recognize as legitimate. The information that it gathers is clothed in a deceptive simplicity that hides the contextual network from which it was lifted. It talks about whether strategies work without examining why they work, and thus excludes the kinds of information that a teacher needs to know if he is to chose a strategy that speaks to his particular classroom situation.

The mediating process paradigm examines the relation between teacher behaviors and students' response variables. It is distinguished from the process/product paradigm because it does not focus only upon measures of student achievement but looks at a broad range of student learning processes, emphasizing the activity of the student that mediates between the stimulus of a particular teaching behavior and the student's ultimate response to that behavior. This paradigm asks, "how do teacher behaviors effect student behaviors?" As the mediating process paradigm shifts its focus from effectiveness to effects, it questions the processes of attending, translating, segmenting, rehearsing as information processing responses which the student employs in the classroom setting. These processes are more closely related to the teaching event than are the outcomes or terminal behaviors, to borrow Mager's term, that characterize the process/product paradigm.

Doyle applauds the mediating process' emphasis on the activity

of the student as it admits a broader range of behaviors and more contextual information to the researcher's study of teacher effects. The conditional nature of effectiveness is acknowledged in the mediating process paradigm:

> Indeed, it would seem that the quality of an instructional method does not reside in the method itself, but rather depends upon its effects under specified circumstances defined by the learning task characteristics of the learners and the point in a learning sequence in which the method is being utilized.
>
> (Doyle, 1978, p. 29)

Despite the presence within the mediating process paradigm of the student as a thinking, choosing, discriminating person, Doyle finds that it still favors heavily controlled instructional settings that provide impoverished representation of the classroom situation. The responses it examines are more human in that they imply the student's freedom to select the focus and mode of his own attention. Nevertheless, in this paradigm his behavior and that of the teacher are both severed from intent, from the continuity of their own personal histories, and from the spontaneity and complexity that characterize the classroom as the learning environment this research claims to address.

The classroom ecology paradigm asks, "how does this system work?" without anticipating the structure of the system or imposing normative criteria to describe or evaluate it. It adopts a neutral position that abstains from the pragmatic view that a studies situation in order to improve it or to lift from it rules that can be quickly applied to teacher training. Doyle presents its inquiry

as "what skills does continuous experience with classroom demands engender in the student?" Research that follows the classroom ecology paradigm testifies to the ambiguity of instructional methodologies and the impact of the social relations that exist within the classroom upon the performance-grade exchange. He suggests that students cannot confidently feed effort or performance into a classroom setting as one would feed material into a machine and anticipate the product that will emerge. Most interesting is Cicourel's observation (1974) that the successful student must develop an interpretive competance which enables him to negotiate classroom meaning. I would suggest that interpretive competance must be seen as a task that confronts teachers as well as students. Not only must the student divine what the teacher means, the teacher must also discover and acknowledge what the teacher means and must make that meaning explicit, both in his language and in his behavior. Interpretive competancy is reflexive, requiring the teacher to attend to his own actions, saturated though they may be with the idioms and customs of conventional classroom management, discourse and instructional techniques, in order to discover the ways in which these modes of communication both convey and distort his intentions.

Doyle's presentation of these three research paradigms clearly reveals his preference for the classroom ecology approach. By identifying patterns and structures in the classroom environment rather than focussing upon discrete teaching behaviors, this

paradigm recognizes the complexity and texture that characterizes the human situation.

This very emphasis on actions taken within a particular setting is advanced in Joseph Schwab's insistence that curriculum design and research be practical. In distinguishing a practical method from a theoretical one, Schwab maintains that its target is a decision about action in a concrete situation rather than a generalization of explanation. (1972) A decision that is practical is incremental in its approach to change, not revolutionary. Schwab tells us that a practical decision "begins with the requirement that existing institutions and existing practices be preserved and altered piecemeal, not dismantled and replaced." (p. 91) Furthermore, a decision that is practical must consider its effects upon the other parts of the structure that encompasses it. Schwab contends that many innovations dwindle and die because they are isolated from context, oblivious to the traditions and expectations they dismiss and to the adjustments they require.[2] This structural point of Schwab's differs from the organizational approach of Sergiovanni and Starrat in that it does not specify certain characteristics as belonging to identified structures and suggest the adoption of a particular system, but merely recognizes the structural principle that a change in any one of its parts requires some adjustments from all the other parts in order to maintain the structural integrity of the whole.

Schwab's criticism of a theoretical approach to curriculum that idealizes innovations, disregarding their translation into the exigencies of situation is shared by critics of supervision who deplore the intrusion of a supervisor who urges changes that reflect theoretical schemes often inappropriate to a particular situation. Blumberg cites studies that describe teachers' resistance to supervisors, and the discrepancy between the supervisors' and teachers' estimates of the value of supervision.

> Supervisors seem to be out of touch with the classroom. Though they see many teachers in action, they are out of the action and, thus, do not understand what is going on. Their lack of understanding blocks them from real communication with teachers and prevents them from being helpful. (Blumberg, 1974, p. 16)

Cogan points out that there is little substantial knowledge about teaching and learning which the supervisor can muster to support his theory. Research on instruction has provided ambiguous and confusing results and has so far provided convincing data concerning only the simplest of learning tasks (such as the short term memorization of noun pair lists) and little information concerning skills in problem solving, creativity, teacher effectiveness, motivation.

Forewarned is forearmed, and so, taking the advice of Schwab, Blumberg and Cogan, we move out of the theoretical perspective and head for the clinical setting, buoyed by the expectations that there we will encounter the practical realities of schooling and in that encounter learn how to improve them. Nevertheless, our expectations

are disappointed, for like the traveller who returns home only to discover that the candy store is closed, the librarian has passed on, and the pizzeria has been taken over by the laundromat next door, the researcher who returns to the practical often has difficulty recognizing it and understanding what it means to the people who inhabit it. Schwab's reliance on a mechanistic metaphor to describe what actually goes on in classrooms is an example of such a homecoming:

> A second facet of the practical: its actions are undertaken with respect to identified frictions and failures in the machine and inadequacies evidenced in felt shortcomings of its products. This origin of its actions leads to two marked differences in operation from that of theory. Under the control of theory, curricular changes have their origin in new notions of person, group or society, mind or knowledge, which give rise to suggestions of new things curriculum might be or do. This is an origin which, by its nature, takes little or no account of the existing effectiveness of the machine or the consequences to this effectiveness of the institution of novelty....The practical on the other hand, because it institutes changes to repair frictions and deficiencies, is commanded to determine the whole array of possible effects of proposed change, to determine what new frictions and deficiences the proposed change may unintentionally produce.
>
> (Schwab, 1972, p. 93)

We are, at present, infatuated with the practical. Like a lover on the rebound, we are contemptuous of the theoretical orientations of our past endeavors, and embrace the practical with an enthusiasm that is as reductionistic as the idealism that we have recently abandoned. A mechanistic metaphor such as the one that Schwab employs appears whenever we shrink from the awesome injunction to assume responsibility for our actions. Roy Schafer's recent study, A New Language for Psychoanalysis (1976) is an

attempt to undermine the reification of human activity into static concepts such as mind, and self. "Mind", Schafer asserts, "is something we do; it is neither something we have nor something we are or are not related to or in possession of." (1976, p. 133). The intentional arc that delimits a field for human action contains both the human individual and his situation. Situation, like mind, is also something we do. The machine, on the other hand, once designed and tooled takes on a life of its own and we tiptoe around it, mystified, instructional manuals in hand, unable to modify it without turning it off completely. The machine is impervious to both its maker and its products and permits only the most miniscule manipulation of its parts or the whole works jam and must be completely retooled. Implicit in Schwab's mechanistic metaphor is the assumption that if we only knew how it worked, we could fix it. Situation, like mind, has become an it, and once again there is a ghost in the machine - new machine, same old ghost.

Michael Bower has observed a similar movement in psychology where situationism has served to undermine the "tyranny of unaccommodating Procrustean concepts" in clinical and applied fields forcing psychologists to accommodate to the particularities of patient behavior and behavioral contexts. But he notes that taken to its extreme, situationism discredits man as an autonomous, active agent and argues instead for an approach that he calls

"interactionism", one that acknowledges that reality is constructed from a "balanced relationship between the observer and the observed and not out of some divination of an indubitable, rock bottom reality." (1973, p. 331)

Similarly, in phenomenological epistemology the world reveals itself as the answer to the question we put to it. Even our sensory experience of the physical world is presented in the analyses of Merleau-Ponty, not as an imposition of matter upon passive sensory receptors, but as the answer the world gives to the body's question. (Kwant, 1963) Stephen Streeter illustrates this premise in his assertion that our situation is not merely the environment we find ourselves in, but the one we encounter in the pursuit of our freedom:

> The situation...is nothing without man's free intention. Let us think, for example, of the typical situation arising from the fact that I encounter an obstacle. A huge rock lies in my path. Considered in itself, the rock is what it is. It receives the meaning of "obstacle" only from my intention to pass along this path. Only in this way does the situation arise which we call "path blocked by an obstacle."
>
> (Streeter, 1967)

It is the path that the practitioner chooses that determines whether or not the huge rock is an obstacle or not. The classroom is a jail to the student who would be playing soccer, a refuge to the child escaping from abusive parents, a detour to the teacher saving his pay checks until he can apply to law school.

Now what have we said about supervision once we have identified

it as deliberations concerning a specific situation? Does the situation inevitably manifest its laws to anyone sufficiently immersed within it and compel behaviors that are the logical response to the situation's inherent reason? We respond positively if we imagine the practitioner to enjoy a certainty witheld from the theorist that is grounded in his engagement in a concrete situation where he may discover what will and will not work. But that knowledge is not delivered up by the situation merely to inquiry that is, we may say, on location; it requires choice and action. It is as Frost suggests in "Road Not Taken"; we only discover the knowledge our choices provide, "Two roads diverged in a yellow wood, and I/ I took the one less travelled by/ And that has made all the difference." It is knowledge that comes after the fact. The choosing itself transfigures the situation from its status as a field that displays a choice to a background for and a means to a chosen act.

Schafer argues that even extreme situations of danger that would appear to offer little choice of response or activity and are the occasion for resignation and apathy for some, are for others an occasion for courage and resourcefulness.

> For us, the idea of situation is necessarily subjective, and so it must include some estimate of oneself relative to the threats and opportunities in the environment as well as some estimate of these threats relative to oneself. One must be viewing a situation as frightening in order to act frightened in it; one must be viewing it as infuriating in order to act furiously in it. The circularity of these statements indicates again that there

> is no way of treating action and situation as distinct and logically independent variables; at least this is the case so long as one is considering these matters from the standpoint of the agent or subject, which is the psychoanalytic viewpoint.
>
> (Schafer, 1976, p. 337)

For Schafer, action, emotion and situation are all aspects of one interpretive circle. The situation, then, that the supervisor and the teacher address as the ground for the teacher's action, can only be understood as a situation that exists of someone. While the observer sees situation spread out before him on a horizontal axis, a synchronic presence of many variables, the participant aligns it on a vertical axis as a moment in his own inner time. Its interpretation relys upon his own biographic history and individual projects as well as upon the intersection of these themes with those of others who share his time and space. Despite the significance of context in the classroom ecology paradigm, and the respect paid to its temporal, spatial, social integrity, the classroom ecology paradigm as described by Doyle lacks the perspective of the persons for whom the classroom exists as a situation. If we return to Streeter's distinction between the rock considered in itself and the rock considered as an obstacle, we recognize that while the classroom ecology paradigm may describe the position of the rock in relation to the path, the relation of the path to other paths and the access routes between them, the number of people who travel the paths and their behavior toward each other as they negotiate the paths and the rocks, it still does not tell us whether for these people this

rock is a pleasing distraction, a formidable obstacle or a comforting shelter. Because any problem is an obstacle that blocks the paths of particular persons its very bulk, its resistance to an effort to overcome it, will be different for each actor who comes upon it. The obstacle will be different for you who are agile and can clamber over it, for you who can command the power of others to help you move it, and for you, who, because you can neither climb over it nor move it, pitch your tent at its base and call it home.

The Observer's Questions

The observer's view is not the participant's, for what the observer describes becomes the field in which the participant must choose and act. This distinction between the actor and the observer is discussed again and again by Blumberg as he seeks the source of the tensions and misunderstandings that plague the communications of supervisors and teachers.

Arthur Blumberg's study of supervision focuses upon the problem of the supervisor's authority and the teacher's subservience. Even if the supervisor is not obligated to evaluate the teacher in any public way whatsoever, the teacher still feels vulnerable, for it is his behavior that is under scrutiny. The prevailing notion among teachers that supervisors are intruders, whose distance and preconceptions make their concerns and advice irrelevant, reinforces the resistance that is developed in the service of the teachers' vulnerability. In their defensiveness and their eagerness to avoid

the supervisor, teachers resemble the fairytale princes whose entry to magical places are blocked by huge, threatening watchdogs. The princes are always prepared for this encounter, for the watchdogs' malevolence is legendary. The princes pacify the dogs by throwing them some cake or by dropping a veil (supplied in advance by a friendly old witch with tenure) over their heads, and then dart past the distracted sentinels. Blumberg's panacea is to advise the dogs to bark less and lick more. He cites a number of studies to encourage the supervisor to maintain a non-or-indirect approach to the supervisee in conference and urges the supervisor to learn to distinguish between support inducing and defense inducing behaviors.

Cogan confirms the dilemma that Blumberg names in a way that makes the teacher seem even more vulnerable because in Cogan's schemes the teachers' needs and the student's need to learn are at odds. There appears to be an adversary relationship between teacher and student wherein the supervisor's support for the interests of one must necessarily undermine the interests of the other:

> The supervisor is committed as a human being to the teacher as a human being, but as a professional he is committed to improving the student's learning by improving the teacher's performance.
>
> (Cogan, 1973, p. 25)

The question these writers seem to be asking is "how can the relationship of the supervisor and the teacher be useful to the teacher?"

A salient feature of the answers that this question elicits involves distance, the optimal degree of distance that should be

present in the relationship of supervisor and teacher as well as that distance assumed by each that determines his perspective upon what happens in the classroom:

> The very act of asking a question creates a certain distance between the new phase and the preceding phases of the individual or collective existence. Thus, enough distance is present to give rise to the situation of an encounter. Too much distance between the questioner and the questioned subject would deprive the anthropological inquiry of its human character. For encounter and dialog demand a situation that is meaningful for all the persons taking part in it.
>
> (Streeter, 1967, p. 522)

In order to compensate for the supervisory practice where the supervisor is deployed as a spy of the school administration or as a patronizing emissary from the local ivory tower, many writers encourage the supervisor to become familiar with the teacher's setting. What follows is a concern that the supervisor not be threatening accompanied with general references to a Rogerian, client-centered approach to supervision in which the supervisor is a facilitator rather than a critic. Goldhammer (1969) reminisces about his early ventures in supervision and the tentativeness that accompanied them:

> On other occasions, my students and I became so excruciatingly aware of emotional variables and so committed to "therapeutic" approaches that we either panicked when supervisees displayed anxiety and ended supervision conferences prematurely, or wasted unnecessary hours pussyfooting around in innocuous chitchat (which, incidentally generally made the teachers more anxious than ever), under the naive assumption that to do so protected the teachers from emotional "damage".
>
> (Goldhammer, 1969, p. 112)

Blumberg lists many strategies that supervisors can employ to reassure their supervisees, such as letting the teacher speak first in conference, balancing criticism with praise, talking about strengths first etc. Yet, others, especially Goldhammer, maintain that it is important that the supervisor not be completely subsumed in the teacher's point of view, completely cowed by his defenses. Lewis and Miel clearly support this view, recognizing as they cite Remy Kwant, "that there is room for critique wherever man, as a full and responsible being, gives form and shape to his world." (1972, p. 227)

It is obvious that a list of strategies cannot provide a rule for the degree of empathic distance that must be maintained for the supervisor's participation to be relevant and non-threatening, and at the same time, conducive to a realization of the broader possibilities that inhere in the situation in which the teacher must act. What is significant is not the particular advice or criticisms that the supervisor offers so much as the way in which his attitude and perspective provide a model and a distance that the teacher can adopt in order to examine his own behavior. I shall present a method of critical reflection for this called currere approach in the last section of this paper.

While the role of the supervisor as an observer, rather than an actor clearly distances him from the perspective of the teacher, it is useful to note the kinds of distance implied by various observational strategies. Various tactics are suggested to

establish distance between the event that is being observed and the supervisor's view of it. Goldhammer speaks of the tendency of the supervisor to project his own moods, interest and preoccupations upon what he sees, reminding us that " 'reality testing' is never quite as easy as one might wish and that projection, denial and repressions by the ego all tend to affect what we all perceive. Transference also skews perceptions when we 'perceive' meaningful behavior that we have learned to see in past relationships but which does not truly exist in present ones." (1969, p. 292) Supervisors are encouraged to guard against the distortions of their own vision by learning to recognize their own biases and concerns. They are encouraged to either bracket their own themes or, and I find this the more honest and useful of the two alternatives, to claim these themes as their own and make them explicit to the teachers with whom they work. Not even those huge searchlights that scan the skies are neutral, illuminating anything within their range with equal intensity. Those objects that are closer to the light are illuminated more distinctly than those that are further from it. While the human observer can compensate for his preferences and the limitations of his perspective, he cannot possibly eliminate them completely, and to assume a posture of neutrality is to mask them so that they are denied and their distortions hidden from his own perception as well as that of the persons he is observing.

Supervisors are encouraged to use audio and videotapes to

record the event they will analyze so that there is some evidence of the event, aside from their own impressionistic records, that the supervisee can also examine and judge. Various forms of interaction analysis are useful in this regard as they provide a record of selected aspects of teacher-student (and sometimes, but not often, student-student) verbal communications. While Cogan considers various methods of interaction analysis to be useful disciplines for the supervisor to use in order to sharpen his own sensitivity to what he sees and to establish an analytical distance between the event and his own response to it, Cogan finds them too arbitrary and too focussed to describe the full range of communication, (non-verbal as well as verbal) and relationships that constitute the classroom event. Here he appears to concur with Doyle's rejection of Flander's assertion that "all knowledge of teaching that has utility will appear, in one form or another, within the interchange when teachers and students contact each other." (Doyle 1978)

Cogan's observation method requires the supervisor to note behavior patterns for both the teacher and the student. He describes the latter as the corollary of the former, suggesting that for every teacher behavior there is a corresponding student behavior. He suggests the use of transcripts so that the data of the observation will be made accessible to both the supervisor and the teacher. His method resembles the classroom ecology paradigm

in its assertion that people tend to learn what they practice and in its tendency to look for behaviors that are repeated over time. His method is designed to make the teacher, as well as the supervisor, an observer of classroom events. The system represents a flexibility that IA systems lack, yet relys greatly upon the skill of the supervisor to draw generalizations of pattern analysis from the flow of classroom events. Cogan's method represents his concern that constant application of formal observation formats would focus the observer's attention too narrowly and arbitrarily, establishing in that distortion too much distance from the event and thus depriving the observer/situation relation of the dialectical tension and interaction that Streeter refers to as "encounter". On the other hand, as Goldhammer, Cogan and Blumberg have all maintained, observations that are too closely tied to the interest and preconceptions of the observer will insulate him from the event that is taking place and will create a distance between it and his questions of it that is too great to be bridged, denying again, the dialectical possibilities of encounter.

We hear Streeter's concern that there be <u>enough</u> distance to permit a dialogical encounter echoed in Goldhammer's observation that too little distance from the teacher's perspective can lead the supervisor into the entanglements of co-optation. The supervisor who jumps into the scene, offering lesson plans, strategies for teacher-student interaction, sharing his favorite

sure-fire methodologies develops a personal stake in the methods he recommends that may lead him to witness successes that are merely self-fulfilling prophesies. Co-optation that results from too little distance between two groups has been the concern of political scientists studying the tactics and impacts of groups or individuals who attempt to effect a change in the attitudes or procedures of an established social organization. Mann (1975) presents Havelock's persuasive observation that participation leads to complicity as the individual wishes to interpret favorably those issues in which he has participated. The studies of Litwak et al (1970) of the co-optation of opposition groups have led those researchers to recognize the principle of polarity as necessary to the dynamics of change as well as to the development of mediating structures required to integrate opposing views.

Nevertheless this concern about co-optation may not justify the exclusion of the supervisee from the analysis of the observed event. Just as the supervisor must be able to ascertain and adjust his position vis-a-vis the classroom event that he is observing, he must also adjust the distance between him and the supervisee to permit a relation to develop that permits a dialectical interchange. None of the observation strategies can be chosen without the recognition that the classroom does not exist in order to be observed and analyzed. It is a setting in which the teacher, not the supervisor, acts. We find this assertion in the conclusion drawn by Medley and Hill from their study comparing IA systems,

specifically the student orientation of the Flanders system and the teacher orientation of the OSCAR system.

> Both systems seem to measure a number of important stylistic variables of a type which supervisors and teachers in training are likely to be concerned. Which would be more useful in a given instance would seem to depend on the kind of problems which concerned the teacher in question.
>
> (Cogan, 1973 p. 57)

The Participant's Questions

And so we return to what I consider to be the first order questions of supervision, the questions that the teacher asks of her own work, questions that come from her own concerns within the field of her own activity. It is the thesis of this paper that the concept of teacher effectiveness requires that the teacher learn to hear, formulate and articulate her own questions about her experience of teaching and that the primary function of supervision is to establish a dialectic form of reflection upon experience that the teacher can then adapt to her own pedagogical practice.

The ambiguity that burdens the teacher effectiveness research paradigms is not an impediment to this reflective methodology, for it is the very ground for reflection and action. Whereas the researcher cannot possibly investigate all the variables operating in the situation he studies, the teacher's own behavior in her situation synthesizes them all. To greater or lesser degree, the determinants of student achievement, student learning processes, the social relations, physical setting, cultural style of the

classroom are all addressed in the teacher's daily activity in the classroom. Whereas the researcher may enjoy the methodological simplicity and elegance of examining these variables one by one the teacher's daily activity simultaneously adopts and tests hypotheses concerning all these variables. The questions that she asks are what Cronbach calls "short-run empiricism" in which "one monitors responses to the treatment and adjusts it, instead of prescribing a fixed treatment on the basis of a generalization from prior experience with other persons or in other locals." (Cited in Doyle, 1978) What is required is a methodology that will help the teacher to learn what he already knows by providing him with a way to extract information from his own response to his situation.

As Doyle's presentation of research paradigms and the many references to the defensiveness of teachers in the literature on supervision testify, neither the laboratory nor the school nourish doubt. Researchers are rewarded for conclusive findings that are broadly applicable. Teachers are rewarded for supporting the standardized curriculum and methodologies as well as the cultural biases and norms of the system in which they teach. Most schools provide little opportunity for the teacher to apply critical reflection to their work. They are rarely, and perfunctorily observed by department chairmen, principals and central office administrators. Peer supervision is rarely practiced. Teachers are isolated from their peers, and spend hour after hour in self-

enclosed classrooms, in front of children whose faces are their only mirrors. How often does the classroom teacher see his reflection in an IA matrix, a videotape, a pattern analysis? His information is lodged in his own response to and reclamation of whatever happened that day. Because, as Stephen Streeter has asserted, "the very act of asking a question creates a certain distance between the new phase and the preceding phases of human existence", we have adapted an autobiographical method of reflection, currere, devised by William Pinar (Pinar, Grumet 1976), to establish the distance that will permit the teacher to ask questions of her own work. As Doyle's criticism of the process/product paradigm and Blumberg's criticism of the supervisor's imposition of theory suggest, too much distance diminishes the human character of experience. The questions that issue from too distant a place overshoot their mark. On the other hand, too little distance reveals only fragments, such as one perceives when one looks at a pointillist canvas up close and sees only dots of color. A certain distance is required for one to step back and find these fragments linked in a cohesive pattern that gives them meaning.

The first task for the supervisor who employs the method of currere is to establish the legitimacy of the teacher's questions. An apparent altruism pervades teaching, as it does so many other service professions, that encourages teachers to see their work only as it affects the behavior and responses of others. Drawn out

to its extreme, this position of self-abnegation permits the teacher to practice what Maxine Greene calls "malefic generosity" (1976) an attitude that protects the teacher from naming and taking responsibility for her own interests as they are pursued and expressed in her work with others. Because every question is potentially subversive, offering the possibility that the answer it elicits will contradict the phase that has preceded it, there is, as Cogan and Blumberg note, resistance to the supervisor's questions and a valid concern about whose interests they promote.

The use of an autobiographical methodology permits questions to emerge that are the teacher's, questions that are embedded in the assertions, elisions, contradictions of her own prose. The teacher is asked to write an essay that defines educational experience by presenting an account of specific experiences that fall under that rubric. The teachers tell stories, reminiscences of grade school, travel, family relationships, tales of humiliation, triumph, confusion, revelation. When the stories are very general and muted they bury their questions in cliches and happy endings, and the supervisor's response is to ask for more detail. When the stories are extremely detailed, they often exclude any reference to the writer's response to the events that are chronicled as well as the meanings that have been drawn from them, and then the supervisor's approach is to ask what these meanings might be. Often the interpretations that the teachers provide appear to contradict the stories to which they refer. Ideas about educational experience

are not limited to the research paradigms that Doyle describes. They permeate the culture, providing a mythology so pervasive and unconscious that it subsumes even those experiences in the history of the individual that contradict it. Here the supervisor's familiarity and understanding of the dominant themes of educational psychology, the history of schooling as well as the social and political norms that it perpetuates is crucial if he is to help the writer make the relationship of this mythology and his own experience of education explicit. What these autobiographical pieces initiate is an examination of the teacher's own educational theory, as well as a study of its origins in both the received wisdom and the teacher's own experience.

The questions that are drawn from these autobiographical pieces are the products of a collaboration of teacher and supervisor, and they provide the basis for their relationship as well as the themes that will be extended throughout the classroom observations. As a ground for the inquiry of the classroom observer these questions are much more highly individualized and differentiated than the strength/weakness tallies described by Cogan and Blumberg. The descriptive criteria for the teacher's behavior is not external to the situation nor to the teacher's own view of it. Because they are drawn from his own experience they provide a route of access to his present concerns.

Some of the familiar spectres that haunt supervision, such as problems of authority and intrusion may be diminished within the

interchanges that accompany this methodology. Before the supervisor sets foot in the classroom he has communicated in at least two, detailed, written exchanges with the teacher, and through that interchange, each has gained access to the others questions, style, use of language, and orientation to the situation they share.

II. SUPERVISION

I have chosen to illustrate the application of currere in a case study of work that I pursued as a consultant to the faculty of a school of nursing during the spring of 1976. We have used this method in pre-training programs of teacher education at the University of Rochester (reported in Grumet, 1976) and at the State University College of Arts and Sciences at Geneseo. I am particularly interested in reporting this work with the nursing faculty because it was pursued in an in-service program indicative of the trend toward continuing accreditation of practicing teachers in all fields. Because this method is committed to the teaching situation as it is experienced and interpreted by a particular teacher, it is especially suited to an in-service setting whose practitioners are already enmeshed in a complicated network of relationships and in a long history of pedagogical tradition and habit.

The administrator of this school was eager to provide instruction in teaching methods for the faculty, many of whom had no formal teaching education. As many of the autobiographical statements written by the faculty revealed, most of them had "fallen into teaching."

PL: During my twenty years of intermittant teaching, I never did apply for a teaching position. I changed hospitals as my husband changed job responsibilities and to arrange for birth and care of my three children. I found I always put my husband first, my children second and my position third.

JT: My first reaction when I think of "educational experience" is to laugh. I feel that, for me, formalized education has been a waste and that much of what I've learned has been from curiosity and experience.

RL: Years do pass quickly, indeed it is difficult to believe that my teaching career has spanned a fifteen year period. At Michigan State, students were asked after the basic two year

program why we had selected the Nutrition major, and almost without exception, the responses included;

1) I want to work in a hospital environment
2) I do not want to be a teacher

These many years later, the question is how, when and why did this occur? Work as a therapeutic dietician in hospitals included patient teaching plus informal work with staff and student nurses. As my professional expertise increased I became responsible for teaching groups of patients, clinic teaching, preparing nutrition displays and articles. All these educational experiences were stimulating and satisfying. Therefore, when the need arose to accommodate my employment to the demands of a growing family, the educational environment with its academic year and time schedule was ideal.

By and large this group of women reported frustration with formal education and with theory isolated from practical application. Many described themselves as academically unsuccessful or as seen by their parents as inferior to older siblings who had been better students. For many of these women, ranging in age from 25 to 60, this examination of their own educational experience was an exercise in self-awareness that the demands of their families and the service emphasis of their profession had precluded.

Neither myself, nor my colleague, Joan Stone, a professor of Mathematics at the National Technical Institute for the Deaf, had any previous experience in medical or nursing practice or education. Accordingly, we were reluctant to jump in with prescriptions and advice and elected to observe the teaching situations of these women and to solicit their views of their experience and their work before we would offer suggestions. Our hesitation served to decrease their defensiveness and distrust. In this instance the bracketing of our assumptions and past experience was facilitated by the nature of our disciplines and their distance from nursing education. Nevertheless, had we been supervising teachers in our own areas of expertise that bracketing, though more

difficult to establish and maintain, would have been equally necessary. At our initial meetings with the faculty we described our own training and points of view and explained that we had not been employed to evaluate the teachers individually and that our communications with them would not be shared with the school's administrator. Despite this disclaimer, the faculty was suspicious and wary, and it took some time to convince them that we were not undercover agents. We took care to remove our communications with them from the administrative channels that were available. Faculty members were free to decline participation in our program, and two of the eighteen teachers exercised that option.

We were particularly interested in the variety of teaching situations that this faculty shared with its students. It met with them in didactic, large lecture classes, small group clinical conferences, and one-to-one interactions of the patient floors. While we addressed the work in each of these settings, we eventually considered the question of how these different contacts might serve to reinforce or undermine each other. In many cases one instructor followed one group of students in each setting, but in others the tasks were divided, and the instructor in the clinical setting was not the one who had determined the theoretical focus of the lectures. While the faculty was inclined to see the clinical work as an occasion for demonstrating the practical application of theory, it was less prone to recognize the opportunities to draw theory from events and activities that were discussed on the floors and in clinical conferences.

As we commented upon the work that we observed, we frequently attempted to connect themes that had emerged in the teachers' auto-

biographical accounts of their own educational experience to the situations that they now shared with their students:

To PT: Now that I have seen you teach in two situations, I am struck by the discrepancy between the tremendous energy and interest that you bring to this work and the last paragraphs of your autobiographical essay in which you wonder why you are teaching. It is clearly more complicated than merely having a task to occupy you while your husband works evenings. If you are willing to take another look at this question, I'd be interested in your answers.

To RL: In your autobiography you spoke of the different educational experiences that you and your own children have had as you distinguish the experience of the "have nots" from the "haves" generations. I'm wondering where you think your students fit? Some obviously need to make money, but others, because of familial support or the reduction of jobs due to the recession, need to find their own reasons for their educational activity. Ironically, this second group may have more difficulty than the first, for if the classes are not merely instrumental means to other ends, these students need to experience them as meaningful events in themselves. My remarks are directed to this issue, how can the students, as they sit there, talk, take notes, experience themselves as learners?

While many of the faculty condemned the empty theory and memorization of their own schooling, they replicated this arbitrary and alienating presentation of material in their own lectures. Controlled by their past experience, they imitated models they disdained and often expressed their own dissatisfaction with the results of their performance. I often addressed this problem in responses written after having observed them teach:

To JG: I'm writing to review some of my observations and our discussion and to relate them, if I can, to some of the themes in your autobiographical piece.
The central question:
Does what you emphasized with the students represent your major concerns? It seems to me that some of the problem with what appears to be routine and frustrating to you in your own instruction, is an emphasis that masks or merely grazes your own interests. Clearly, there is specific information to be delivered and procedures to be explained, but your own interest in this work is important. How can

you make it explicit in your work with the students?

To BK: The most important question in my view is to consider how you can find the direction and energy in the didactic material that you find and express so effectively in the clinical. You were really present, standing behind your words when you were speaking about issues of communication with patients (the discussion on not evading sensitive issues, for example). You had that same energy in the beginning when you were reading the poem and citing the statistics, but then you lost it, and the momentum faltered and the direction of the lecture became uncertain. It is difficult in an overview kind of presentation that you have done many times before to identify the focus you really want to create, but a review of the material from your present point of interest and concern may reveal a new structure for it that will be closer to what you have to say at this point in your own thought and work.

The suggestion to claim the content of these lectures as their own was a demanding one for this faculty. It challenged the ethos of self-abnegation that saturated their professional practice as well as the role models presented to them in their own schooling. MT's auto-biographical essay described this reticence:

> I would like to be better able to be open enough to discuss my learning experiences with students - or perhaps this is imposing my internalized values on students.
>
> As I continue to think about what I am writing here, I have come to the obvious conclusion that my idea of what I learned in the area of values comes not from my formal education but from my experiences. I suppose this is what we're doing by correlating theory and practice in the clinical areas. This is easier to do with the biologic facts than it is with the psycho-social. I need help with the latter.

MT's hesitance was mirrored in many of her colleagues' writings. For each faculty member the problem of assertion, no matter how generally pertinent, had a very particular history and expression. The writings of JW demonstrate the manner in which this issue was developed in our dialogue. I have sifted through our correspondence which ranged over many topics, and have selected the material that pertained to this

theme.

The Theorist's Questions

JW was a clinical instructor in psychiatric nursing. She worked with each group of students for six weeks on a closed floor in the State Hospital. I observed her in that setting twice, but my first visit was preceded by considerable communication between us, as the material that follows will indicate. The faculty had submitted one formal essay and responded to questions that I had posed before I observed them teaching. After each observation I would write a letter summarizing the content of my observations and suggestions as well as the gist of our post-observation conference. In addition, the faculty kept journals of their daily teaching experience which we also discussed. JW's extensive use of the method permits me to offer our correspondence as evidence of this reflexive process and its relationship to the interpretation of the teaching situation.

While the dialogue that follows suggests the immediacy of a conversational exchange, there were actually spans of one to three weeks that stretched between these interchanges. These time lapses, together with the injunction that this communication be written rather than oral, contributed distance to the supervisory relationship, allowing the teacher to choose and edit the material she wished to share. These features were designed to inhibit the transferences that accompany this kind of dialogue and the relationship that supports it so that the teacher's insights would not be subsumed by that relationship. (A more extensive rationale for the use of written communication is offered in Toward a Poor Curriculum, Pinar, Grumet, 1976, and "Songs and Situations",

Grumet, 1978.) Furthermore, teachers were not required to respond to any or all of the questions posed by this supervisor and the written form extends a freedom not to respond that is often absent in conversation.

The piece that follows is JW's analysis of the phrase, "educational experience" developed through the narrative of events that she associated with that concept. At the time, I numbered those sentences to which I was responding and recorded my comments and questions on separate pages. In order to make the sequence of the dialogue more apparent, I present my comments and her responses as interpolated into the text of her original piece. The passages from the initial piece are coded T (teacher) -1 and my responses are coded S (supervisor) -1. I have followed the same pattern for our later correspondence on these themes, coding her next set of responses T-2 and my subsequent comments, S-2. Brief remarks addressing the use of the method as revealed in the dialogue are appended to each section.

T-1: Basically all of life is an ongoing educational experience. We learn in proportion to our needs and readiness. The environment and people around us directly or indirectly influence this learning in either positive or negative ways--sometimes both! I see my role as an instructor as one of a "facilitator".

S-1: The word is friendly, reassuring, certainly more attractive than drill sergeant, more modest than model. But I don't trust it. I think it simplifies a complex interaction by reducing the dialogic functions in pedagogy to bland acceptance. That's overstated I know. I'll take another crack at it later.

T-2: I see a facilitator as one who establishes an appropriate climate. By appropriate I mean one that will contribute, not distract, from the learning process. In my field I see this as a low key setting eliminating as much pressure/stress as possible. I did not mean that it's bland/status quo. I did not mean that we vacillate-going no where. I don't see that as true. I teach - but encourage progress at their pace. All must accomplish certain clinical objectives so we are structured.

Awareness/reduction of anxiety/communications skills/self-awareness progress at an individual pace. There is opportunity to do the minimum - or press further with more responsibilities. I would love to see the latter for all. In fact, I try to provide some dissonance to that end -- but low key. I try also to serve as an appropriate role model - because they need this to learn. Not all started at the same place, nor travel at the same pace, nor will end at the same level. Perhaps my term, facilitator, was inappropriate except I was trying to contrast the clinical role with that of theory - and perhaps with the clinical role in other areas. I still see facilitator as non-judgmental because I believe that adds to decreased stress. I do not see non-judgmental/non assertive as synonymous. The students do not walk all over me. I cannot expect students to be non-judgmental/calm with patients if I can't be that way with them (back to the role model). I picked facilitator as opposed to role model (modesty is not a trait I hang up on) because I think it is more encompassing of all facets of the job. Before you comment on this please read 3. I feel a strong bond between the two - cause/effect type thing.

S-2: Perhaps what we're both getting at is the use of the term as an adjective instead of a noun. To be facilitative as a teacher may be to provide the setting for personal interaction that you describe without being subsumed by its connotations of confirmation.

T-3: Back to the written communications again -- response to your second set of responses and numbered to correspond with them.

Facilitator Role - I hung on to the term so securely because that is exactly what I did. I'm seeing the need to be more directive - <u>make</u> things happen, not <u>let</u> things happen. Perhaps I can deal with it in subtle ways, but not totally, and maybe this isn't important. I can see very clearly at this point where I fell into this pattern - not knowing what specifically is being taught in theory contributed to this in part. I was <u>extremely</u> uncomfortable in the beginning, but I found a technique or pattern that seemed fairly efficient, was comfortable for me and I adopted it -- more appropriately, slid into it. Rethinking this, I can deal with the entire project in a more directive way without being too threatening, as long as I can build an adequate rapport with the students. I keep hanging up on this "non threatening". Maybe I can't be non threatening and still cause dissonance necessary for growth. Maybe threatening is appropriate as long as you can control the outcome so that it is resolved. My ideas on this are still in the "iffy" stage and I need to ponder it longer. I keep feeling I need to deal more gently with students because of the area we're in and the excessive anxiety it

> it causes. I can't get any further at this point except to say that two instituted changes: journals turned in weekly and dual objectives on anecdotals are now the routine. Was interested to see, that after the groans because they had to turn their journals in each week, and the other group didn't, we had a little chat about differences in areas, instructors preferences, and why I want to do it this way, and suddenly they seem pleased about it, the journal part anyway.

My interest in questioning the use of the term, facilitator, was first one of definition. I was interested in ascertaining whether the use of this term was just a synonym for helper or whether it revealed JW's familiarity with a Rogerian, client-centered approach to teaching. Because this term is frequently associated with this particular therapeutic approach, I was eager to ascertain whether it was being used as an intentional reference to this approach or whether it was being employed to mask the teacher's confusion or ambivalence concerning the kinds and degree of intervention in a student's learning experience that she considered appropriate and useful. If facilitation was being interpreted as non-intervention, I was eager to investigate the ways in which choosing not to intervene was meaningful as an act of omission as opposed to commission. Rather than suggesting that there would be a simple formula that could be applied to settle this confusion, I was interested in eliciting a response that would reveal JW's awareness of the complexity embedded in the term and in the teacher-student relationship that it addressed.

My own interest in this issue was, in part, determined by my own experience as a student and a teacher. Too often I had experienced praise or acceptance of my work as a reluctance on the part of my teacher to attend to its quality and to my development, seeing him or her as loathe to engage in the dissonance and tension that accompanies

criticism. Rather than relate my own experience by trading stories, I chose to indicate the personal tone of my challenge without shifting the focus from the teacher's experience to my own.

When I responded to the first essay, I had had little or no personal contact with the writer and was responding to what appeared salient in the writing rather than to cues that might have emerged in her teaching or in watching her interact with others. This manner of introduction permits the teacher to control the way in which she presents herself to the supervisor and to select the topics for their discussion. Most significantly, the first essay suggested a contradiction between the non-threatening posture of a facilitator as claimed at the outset and later accounts of significant educational experiences that revolved around competition and stress.

***

T-1: The area I teach in is a locked female unit at RPC. By nature of locked doors, noises, activities of an anxiety producing nature; there are many "environmental" things stacked against a good learning environment. I see my role as attempting to set an "alternate climate" of relaxed openness, honesty and support that accepts the student as she is and tries to open doors.

S-1: I'm not sure what you're getting at. Are the students frightened? Do they respond with a desire to control patients as they struggle to control their own anxiety?

T-2: "Are the students frightened?" The first days are usually terrible for them. All their friends who have been there before share their worst experiences. They can't go anywhere on the locked unit without my key, hence me -- including to the john. The ladies' appearances in some cases are frightening and their actions, in some cases, gross. Most certainly screaming, fighting, chair and table dumping, a patient who sometimes starts fires on the floor, bleak somewhat barren dayroom, very little visible staff except me, all add to their anxieties -- and very understandably so! Some days are very quiet, the majority usually. However, we have a rash of anxious people currently and one patient's anxiety increases the next - the domino effect. There is reason for fear as there is potential danger to the students.

No-the students do not initially respond with a desire to control the patients. In some instances they would rather not deal with them at all in the beginning. Their anxiety level initially allows them to deal only with their own anxiety. It seems only as they deal with their own anxiety can they deal with patients; and to "deal effectively" takes longer. Though this is not actually pertinent to your question, I feel you need to understand also part of the other frustrations these gals feel. They are clinically oriented in the other areas to move at a steady pace to get their work done. They perform a skill, instantly find satisfaction from a good job/ instructor approval - or likewise, disapproval. Dealing with psych. patients is different. The pace is very slow and, as I'm sure you're aware, the changes long in coming in many instances (sometimes never really visible to the student)- especially with these elderly chronic patients. Students want to see patient changes with 2 or 3 interactions and that is not realistic. Perhaps if the unit is anxious on the day you come, you will understand better. I honestly feel one of the best things I can offer them is some help with self awareness - the cause/effect interplay: The ability to look at their feelings/anxieties, step back and begin to understand them.

S-2: My first curiosity comes from your own choice of this setting? Has it (does it) frighten you? I worry about my own response to it and hope that I will not be so overwhelmed that I can not be of any use to you. I find that even in the supposedly less problematic settings in the hospital my own responses to what I see are so strong, that it takes a real feat of concentration to look at how others are responding and not to get caught up in my own reactions. I would add that my impression is that the apparently neat tasks in other services rarely seem as neat to me as they are presented to the students. I wonder whether the distinction here is that of the setting or of your own ability to acknowledge and deal with open ended problems and ambiguity. I suspect that even on "med. surg." your awareness would lead you to make the challenge less tidy.

T-3: I am assuming "curiosity from your own choice of this setting" refers in part to why I chose Psych nursing? You did ask that on Wednesday anyway. First of all, "does it frighten me?" It did frighten me as a student at State - the unknown. Does it now? My anxiety is clearly higher some days than it is others. However, frighten is not appropriate by my connotation. It's too strong. I could not work with fright because it would block sound functioning. A slightly increased anxiety seems to serve to tune me higher, increase my vigilance. There is probably an ego component in here also. I like to think I know what I'm doing and I know I can take care of myself on this floor. If I didn't feel this, I wouldn't be comfortable

taking students on the floor. Why psych? Of all the fields I explored through nursing education, it was the most stimulating, the least dominated by structure/stricture. I don't refer to the course, rather than the practice. It seemed like a vital field, more in the acute setting, however. It dealt with people, a whole spectrum of responses/interactions. The challenge was great with such a variety of patients. It wasn't mechanical so there was enough stimulation to at least stay functional. To make it even more appealing at that point, a job dropped in my lap without much effort on my part. Till this semester there have been at least 3 of us in psych - the interactions 3 ways are less demanding and allow "pull back" time that this 2 person communication doesn't. It took me till now to realize that this is probably where my unrest is. I've always mediated before, now I have to deal directly. My choice of area? I suppose that being on 5F today is my choice to a point. I was initially put there because the experienced didn't want anything to do with it. I've remained and staunchly fought to remain because I am firmly convinced that the real learning for the students is on the closed units. They are forced to deal with self awareness and oh, so many other things that can be fairly easily avoided on an open unit. Psych block provides a unique opportunity for the students; the pace is slower, it's less structured, there is need to deal with concept, not good old black and white procedures.

In these interchanges I was eager to elicit JW's interpretation of this setting as it appeared to her students and as it appeared to her. The anxiety she mentions may be shared by all who meet there, patients, staff, students, teacher, supervisor. Furthermore, if anxiety were a salient feature of this setting, I was interested in having this teacher reflect upon her own reasons for choosing to work is this milieu. If the facilitation orientation signified a reluctance to assume responsibility for contributing to a student's anxiety, then work in a setting that provided its own grounds for anxiety might serve to excuse JW from seeing herself as an irritant and permit her to assume an ameliorative role, instead.

My second response challenges JW to consider the degree to which she projects onto the situation a quality of complexity that may belong

more properly to her own style of interpreting any given situation in which she must act.

In JW's third reponse she speaks of the closed unit as forcing the students to deal with self-awareness, suggesting a preference for confrontation disclaimed in the facilitator posture, but attributed, at this point, to the setting of the closed unit rather than to her own pedagogical intention.

***

T-1: I hope the students see me as non-threatening, as so much of the learning deals with self awareness and how they are "feeling" in different situations. To be truly successful this also means that group rapport must be established. This is one of the most difficult areas to deal with. Students seem conditioned to competition in this day and generation, perhaps more so than in the past. I get the feeling that it isn't pure "do your best", but also "stomp on the rest". I never cease to be amazed at the way students put each other down. I try to deal with this (when it becomes evident) indirectly using patient examples and hope that at least some will be able to transfer and internalize.

S-1: Do you ever articulate your own perception of this competitiveness to the group as a whole, presenting it as a problem for them to work on together?

T-2: I have dealt with this directly in the past a couple of times. I have not handled it effectively somehow if the criteria is solution of the problem. Awareness I have gotten through. It's a subtle thing somehow and shows in an unwillingness to help a fellow student. At times we deal with student/patient problems as a team. I encourage them to ask the others for assistance/support/reinforcement. Some students will help no one unless they feel I'm watching. Many will only aid friends unless I become a bit more adamant. I might not even have mentioned the competition in the paper in relation to the students except I was in the middle of a situation where most of the group was stomping an underdog at the time I wrote the paper. It does not seem very prevalent in this group.

Because teachers and students in diverse settings tend to focus exclusively upon content, whether it is ancient history, the relationship of Prince Hal and Falstaff, or the care of psychotic patients, and ignore

their existential reality as they operate on this other one, I was eager to ascertain this teacher's readiness to examine with her students the content of their own interactions.

My question in response to this description of the students' competitiveness is intended to elicit the degree to which JW reveals her perception of the situation, in this instance the social relationships among the students, to the students who share it. If students are seen to be "conditioned to competition" and competition is understood to be characteristic of our time, then the teacher is discounting any possibility of effecting a change in these relationships.

Whereas I might have asked JW to consider the ways in which her own design for the course or methods of evaluation or interaction may have contributed to the competition she observed, that inquiry would have had the quality of accusation that I was eager to avoid. There would be opportunity to comment on her unwitting complicity if I observed it in observation. In T-2, JW describes this issue as no longer pertinent, and so we let it go.

***

T-1: I give no grades, it's a pass/fail type of thing.

S-1: Do you find that students are insecure when they do not receive a grade, a stylized measure of "how they are doing"? Do you find that you have the time to communicate with them fully in a more personal way?

T-2: Nursing appears different from other courses. Clinical final grade is pass/fail for all clinical courses. For that reason I guess the students are conditioned. I somehow feel the more effective measure is going over their papers and floor work with them individually. As for time - yes, I can usually make the time -- but the place is the problem. When the anxiety level of the floor is high, I feel very uncomfortable leaving it - thus a block to my thought/communications processes. If I conference in the day room - the noise level and activities block both of us, and the paranoid ladies are

convinced we are discussing them. When anxiety level is down I chance it and use our little room. I have found many students can verbalize better than they write - at least in this course. Many times what I read on a paper does not say what I hear talking to them, and the verbal response is the appropriate one. Because there is no way I can or will spoon feed them exact words for communication, they need to find their own, and I try to serve as a sounding board for this.

S-2: One problem that bothers me about not giving grades in the clinical area is the tendency to overlook grave deficiencies in the skills that situation requires. Does it ever bother you that the students who are more compassionate than others, less competitive than others, etc., don't have these competencies recognized on the ledger with the same weight as that given to technical competance or academic performance? I'm interested in your comments about the students' spoken and written language, particularly because it relates to the application of this method to other settings and other groups of people. One feature of the written communication is that it may remove us from the very center of the communication. For some students that distance would be intolerable but for others it may free them from the impact of our personalities, of our language and its subtle power to shape their own.

T-3: Midway through you commented on ..."One feature of the written communication is that it may remove us from the very center of communication. For some students that distance would be intolerable, but for others it may free them..." That statement brought a question. Do you really find that students who can't handle the personality aspect can handle the written communication <u>without</u> it? I put myself in the writer category to an extent, yet the personality aspect was quite vital to me. I'll accept your comment on "subtle powers of language" and all those implications. However, I'm sensing a need for trust if I'm going to write what I really think/feel. I perceive my style would change dependent on who presented; not to please them, but more of the idea of my comfort. There are blocks in my first paper that I would have excluded dependent on who was reading it, because they made me very uncomfortable in the writing. These have been some of the strongest discussion areas we've had. I can't at this point define/dissect those feelings. The whole thing is somehow contrary to my current pattern - flashback behavior I guess. Basically, that first paper was for you, assigned and carried out. I will admit that it made me think, intriqued me somewhat, but that one was for you. The rest, I must claim. I couldn't let it go - it's just exploded all around me, and that's another why? Without the comfort to write the first directly and honestly, the second might never have been.

> I'm not discounting the effect of your responses and technique to stimulate and challenge. I'm a bit disturbed by not being able to understand why I had the need to write. When others wanted no part of this - talking about it was enough. I suppose it deals with some basic attitudes or needs -- more questions, will it never end? Black and white was much more comfortable in some ways.

In questioning non-grading, I am probing the facilitative posture again, hoping to understand whether non-grading is chosen as a means of abstaining from confrontation or whether other forms of evaluation are used in place of grades. At times instructors would bemoan their students' apathy in the clinical setting, attributing it, in part, to the students' grade-time economy emphasis on classwork for which they received grades. JW chose not to respond to my suggestion that non-grading in the clinical courses demeaned them, assuming that the students were "conditioned" to that scheme. While I might have chosen to challenge that assumption her own concerns related to her immediate communications with her students rather than to the general policies of the school which was going to close the following year. In conversation she indicated that she saw my approach to this question as too directive. She responds by challenging my own methods, in particular my reluctance to acknowledge that my own personality and approach, as revealed in the introductory seminar to the supervision project, determine the willingness of the teachers to embark upon the writing project. Similarly, the phrase, "others wanted no part of this" appears to exaggerate the resistance of others in the project, again serving to undermine my method or to accentuate her responsiveness in contrast to theirs.

I abstain from written responses to these themes and withold

interpretations that point to her own competitiveness with the other teachers as well as ones that would suggest that she is disclaiming her own involvement in this work by attributing it to my charisma. Both these themes emerged in later writings and subsequent discussions but in both instances she brought them up directly and that presentation was preferable to one in which I might have revealed them as already present, lurking under her prose, obvious to me, but hidden from her.

***

T-1: Educational experiences that I see as molding my attitudes; what a broad subject that is. I can go way way back and say that perhaps one of the strongest influencing factors was negative. As far back as I can remember, I worked for grades to please my parents. That was a very involved issue, but a highly competitive nature in regard to some things remains with me today as a residual.

S-1: How does the competitiveness of the students differ from your own? Was yours more oriented toward family and less toward peers?

T-2: Touche' Competition for me was originally fostered within the home, but not in a sibling rivalry type of thing as my brother is 13½ years younger than I. Initially it was a self competitive thing (illogical by definition) except where sports or this type of thing were concerned. I don't really recall peer competition in academic areas really till nursing school. Perhaps I was just oblivious. However in the Phys. Ed. major program, it was highly competitive. Frankly I enjoyed this because I generally did well. It was highly present in nursing school and the striving caused much anxiety and to a point I think, decreased learning. I keep hanging up on competition. Perhaps I'm intertwining Deutsch's competition/conflict. I see this competition as an inbred process - present throughout life. Ours is an extremely competitive society. My concern with it in the educational process is that it blocks learning and achieving for a great many. Slow learners initially may fall in the pattern of being losers. We continue this in various ways throughout formal education. I'll accept the presence of competition. I'll accept that for some it's a driving stimulant for achievement and there are positive advantages. But, what happens to the group that gets trampled; what happens to their motivation? I'm inclined to believe that we see them later as patients in

our mental health centers. We educate students to care little about anyone except self and that frightens me. Huxley's Brave New World may not be far off...The more I write, the more I'm beginning to see this very strongly in relation to self and I can't pull back far enough to be totally objective. I'm basically an intensely competitive person. It's worked for me, but not without a price...I can't yet explain why. Also, a question. Is there something akin to competition - perhaps found in competitive people - that drives them to need to succeed, to prove themselves to themselves/others or some such? This is not truly a competitive thing as there is no winner/loser.

S-2: You might be interested in looking at Donald Oliver's book, Education and Community where he examines the misguided individualism that you have identified and looks at other cultures where education and the concept of community are more closely intertwined. I think that I understand what you are saying about competition, that the motivating interest may not be to see others demeaned as you succeed, but may merely reflect a self-esteem that is dependent upon the appraisal of others. It is ironic to think that the most competitive person may be the most dependent and that some of the losers may in fact be less concerned about how their behavior is appraised by others, and in effect liberated from the coercion of courting favor.

My first question is designed to point up a theme, competition, that has appeared previously as related to students and now emerges in relation to herself.

Rather than direct the inquiry to further biography, I offer a reference to Oliver's book. By suggesting readings and emphasizing a a theoretical route to this question, I hope to underscore the status of this concern as common to many practitioners and to integrate voices other than my own into our dialogue. I also recognize her resistance to delve into her own family history of competitiveness at this point as revealed in "I'm beginning to see this very strongly in relation to self, and I can't pull back far enough to be totally objective." Here again, I tread carefully, reluctant to be the one who demands material that is not offered, aware that her history is unknown to me and

respectful of her own caution and hesitance.

My final comment exercises my option to introduce an alternative interpretation of competition and to contribute to the distancing that she requires in order to pursue this subject.

***

T-1: I remember my first college experience as being pretty much an extension of high school in the early 50's, with flashes of "special experiences". I don't remember a tremendous amount of intellectual stimulation. There was, however, an English professor who challenged, opened doors and dared us to learn -- to read more than we had to. He was a sarcastic bastard.

S-1: Would you call him a facilitator?

T-2: No, I'd call him exactly what I called him initially. He had a gross disgust for Phys. Ed. majors as being "illiterate, uncouth slobs" (his words, not mine). This attitude incensed me. I loved poetry, classical music, sunrises -- and I abhorred stereotyping. It was a somewhat tense/painful experience. Much of it was interpreted by me as a personal assault on my intelligence. No - too much discomfort - not a facilitator by my definition. My understandings of him then and now are very different. It's interesting to note that my competitive nature entered in here. He did not affect most of my fellow classmates this way - they hated him for the most part. However, he was astute in using my own feelings to open doors for me and he did this extremely well. I shall always be grateful to him for that.

S-2: Where does competition enter into your response to this teacher? In a desire to prove him wrong, to make him acknowledge your intelligence and relinquish his stereotypes? Your classmates hated him and therefore didn't give a damn what he thought of them? You must have triumphed to be remembering him with some gratitude. If the stereotypes were thoroughly claimed would he have bothered to provide an intellectual challenge to you? Something isn't meshing here.

T-3: This is a piece of the last communication. I couldn't reach it at the point I gave you the other one. Perhaps if I can walk through this from beginning to end, I can put it in perspective so that it <u>will</u> mesh. Freshman English was a constant hassle with him. We went to class from 2 hours in the pool. Our normal dress would probably have been sweatsuits, jeans and sweaters or something else warm. He demanded skirts. We refused and the battle started. The

course was in composition, and I enjoyed writing, that was no problem -- until he read one to the class, commented, they laughed, teased, and I blushed. From there it was all downhill. I refused to write, he ridiculed and I blushed and withdrew further (pattern already set?) I was not alone - he diminished everyone in the class, but the barbs were sharper in my direction, at least it seemed so to me. He'd use a decent vocabulary, then define the words for the "illiterate phys. eds." I learned to research very carefully, gave him back his vocabulary, proofread, just to be sure that I left no openings. I was angry. It was like a vendetta to prove him wrong; to show him that his stereotypes were wrong, and to protect myself from his sarcasm (and I do call that somewhat competitive). For a group that was pretty united generally, it almost felt like everyone for herself. We individually felt relieved when he hassled someone else because of the respite it gave us. Somewhere in here, however, I began to realize that my vocabulary was better, I lived less constantly with the dictionary. He gave me a rough time for the whole semester, but the taunts seemed to lose their edge a bit. Perhaps we were just so used to it. The semester ended, and though I was relieved it was over, I really missed some of the intellectual aspects.

Second semester began with another instructor -- and then there was a change in classes and he was back again. It was more of the same - this time with literature - prose. It was a replay, but perhaps not quite as heated. He continued to make his daily derogatory remarks about the phys. eds. I couldn't handle that (I was never able to handle that and that's an intrigue now also - why cling to the stereotype I was rapidly rejecting? I must also have seen myself as bright back then, where did I lose it?) At any rate, I found myself not only doing the required readings, but others by the same author for my own comparison. He never praised, it wasn't his style. There must have been some positive reinforcement, but it escapes me at this point other than the excitement of the material, the kind of learnings. Perhaps this was game playing also - maybe sarcasm was reinforcing in some respect.

Ran into him occasionally during the next 2 years around the campus. He sang in the chorus and at concert time the barbs were directed at shouldn't a phys. ed. play drums rather than oboe. The chorus sang for the Christmas program and the modern dance class was forced to perform. My strong area was definitely not modern dance. At this point I heard about how well my red face went with the blue leotard. Yet when an injured shoulder healed wrong, and I was unable to use the arm, he demonstrated some concern along with the barbs about clumsy Phys. Eds. Audited a few English literature courses

here and there at his suggestion, but not with him. Interestingly as I recall, even those suggestions were barbed.

Senior year brought him again for the class in poetry. It was a somewhat mellower experience for me, as I recall; less hostility, but still the hassle, ridicule and embarrassment. He used my own reactions to make me reach, always had I guess. I can recall trying to not respond, and being unable to keep my mouth shut. We had several good discussions that year, and I guess I sort of understood a bit better. He was bright and intellectually frustrated. Phys. Eds. weren't dumb. They carried a far more difficult course than their General Elem. counterparts. It was heavily science oriented at that point in time - about 4 hours from pre-med. He wouldn't accept that because on the whole we didn't respond well to his subject. He didn't like our dress, attitude, walk, style or anything else about us. Had I been him, I would have gone elsewhere, but that was his hangup. He also gave me a rough time about the mannish clothes/haircut and all the rest of the stereotype phys ed. accouterment. Graduation day the comment was sarcastic, something trite about dare to be you.

I do not understand why I tolerated all the abuse. I wouldn't today. It obviously wasn't necessary. I've had a hard time being analytical in this area. There was much gain with him, but excessive disruption. Perhaps gain could have been even greater in another manner. Perhaps my response ties in with teacher-pleaser as well as other things. Why, when perhaps the withdraw pattern was already set did I not just use this means? It's taken a long time to get this down, and I don't really know the why of that either. There was a male chauvinist side to him also, but not really a downer type of thing. He wanted females to look and act like females, and though radical women libbers would make mincement of that statement, I think it was valid. One could enjoy a basketball game, for example, and shuck the roughness of the court afterwards. A Phys. Ed. working with children at various impressionable ages gives up one great role model opportunity - that of a female and all the positive things that denotes, if she holds to the stereotype. The teaching position was the proof of that assumption.

I saw him 10 years later for the last time when he suddenly appeared at my door one day. He was still feisty, but more gentle and with some warmth. I saw little of the person I remembered and I was different also. Only his parting remark was reminiscent of the old antagonism, and I laughed. It was rather a bland experience. I don't remember it with any particular emotion for that moment -- only in retrospect when I realized it had been a farewell.

I was viewing only the angry feelings, the struggling, the competitive type thing till I put this all down. I almost completely blocked the warm feelings, gentleness at the end,

till I pulled the whole thing back in this piece. He was really a pretty significant other - how did I miss that all these years -- and did I really miss it, or just not accept it? Our Wednesday's communication sort of flashed back in this direction in some way also. It was like I was reaching back then for something we reached so easily that Wednesday - but I could never quite make it.

Such things I'm seeing here. Patterns that still cause me problems. Coping mechanisms that weren't effective then or now. Some basis for aversion to competition in this educational process, yet proof it drives one to achieve - ambivalent. It seems I dumped some good aspects, positive things somewhere between then and now - and the never ending why. And he cut so long and hard to stifle the emotional, dissect it as weakness, refused to allow us to deal in feeling tone even in very poignant writing. I see this as so intrinsic and constricted a part of him that I dealt with my remembrances of him the same way -- until now.

The intensity in this account of JW's response to her college English professor stood out from the rest of the text of the first essay. In questioning it, I was noting that intensity as well as the way in which this anecdote, more than any others, contradicted the facilitative posture that she had claimed as ideal.

In my second response I am clearly probing her interpretation of this relationship. It is important to distinguish this challenge of contradictory content from a probing that requests biographic information that is not spontaneously offered. This writer chose at another time to provide that biographic material in her own attempts to reconcile the contradictions that I had named, but that option was hers, and she exercised it many weeks later. When I met with JW to ask for her permission to present her writings in this paper, she showed me yet another piece written many months later, in which she extended the biographic content to include her relationship with her father. I was pleased that she had never submitted that material earlier and had kept

it for herself rather than needing to deliver all of her reflective work over to me for my approval.

S-1: There seems to be some pull, some tension in this style of pedogogy that facilitating lacks. Do you think that it is necessary to provide some dissonance, Piaget calls it disequilibrium, to stimulate the student to move, to press further beyond what is comfortable and familiar?

T-2: Yes, I feel there must be something - dissonance if you will - that motivates. Certainly "status quo" promotes nothing productive. I do not believe that it has to be threatening. I'm sorry, I'm not verbalizing this well at all. I see it many times as being subtle - negligible pull/tension. To a point you're using it now with these questions/perceptions. You raised questions that stimulate an introspective posture. I find myself trying to balance between my feelings back then and now; sort of needing to interpret more for myself than for you. That puts you in the role of a catalyst. Maybe I could use facilitator.

S-2: Facilitative, but that's as far as I can go. I still distrust the noun.

These interchanges permitted, once again, the transition from concrete experiences to the theory that addresses them. In reviewing my second response, I am dissatisfied with its inadequacy for it merely hints at a critique of role theory instead of making that critique explicit. By preferring the adjective to the noun, I am choosing to describe human activity in a manner that does not reify it in role or character trait attribution. While Goffman's role theory does reveal to us the roles we play in the social interactions of our daily lives, it stresses the determination of these habitual responses to situation rather than our ability to criticize and recreate the positions we take vis-a-vis each other, and it is this latter emphasis that needs to be integrated into our supervisory practice.

***

T-1: Along with this, I remember small group discussions and the first time anyone ever encouraged disagreement. I can remember still the excitement, hours in the library to find material to defend my radical points of view.

S-1: So the trick is to nuture disagreement and still be non-threatening? Can you do that?

T-2: I believe so, as long as the person nurturing the disagreement is able to maintain a non-judgmental attitude. I also see that as being a tricky skill.

S-2: I'm not sure what you mean by judgmental. Can you like all your students equally, think equally well of all of them? Is being nonjudgmental merely not letting on when you respond negatively? Does it have something to do with claiming your response to the person in question as your own instead of disclaiming your appraisal as your response and attributing it entirely to the behavior or traits of the person?

T-3: Nonjudgmental. Obviously I can't like all the students equally. My personal feelings regarding my students vary student to student - sometimes very deep/concerned, other times I can never seem to get beyond superficial concern - and the emotions scan the spectrum. However only selected emotions are visible to the students. You perceived that yourself Wednesday. The nonjudgmental deals with accepting each person as he/she is without imposing our intolerances/hangups/emotions on them. In some instances one accepts the person, but not the act, i.e., a patient and her tearfulness. This small simple thing perhaps, is gigantic for some students in a situation. Obviously when we must deal with labeling - i.e. post conference, we have not succeeded. Your remark in the car about "choosing" was definitely <u>not</u> non-judgmental -- valid however, I fear.

The problem of evaluation is connected to facilitation. These interchanges address the distinction between making judgments and communicating them. They illustrate, as well, in the reference to my visit, the way in which the on-site observations serve to focus the dialogue again on the teaching situation, while the continued writing provides a way for the teacher to integrate and make her own sense of the writings, the visits and the conversations that follow.

***

T-1: My third year we gained a new Phys. Ed. instructor who dealt with us the same way: insisting we think, allowing us options, consistently challenging our old views -- and again the excitement and the reaching. I remember that year as one of running our own organizations, feeling free to disagree with her with no repercussions. In fact,

she encouraged this. Not all liked her, but we all respected her and learned from her.

S-1: And the other side of the coin, how it feels to know that some students don't like you. As willing as I am to accept that as part of the work I always find it difficult. Do you ever encounter it? Does it bother you?

T-2: I sure do -- fairly frequently. Yes, it bothers me greatly. I can recall at one point in the past going the extra mile with a student who did not like me - an attempt at "undoing". I've rethought that since in many directions. I don't like everyone I meet, nor do I interact well with all. I have no right to expect this of students (that's the intellectualization aspect). The Girl Scouts conditioned me well for this.

S-2: And there's a switch it seems to me for teacher pleasers to become teachers and yet not teachers who must be student pleasers. For that kind of hyper concern to meet the students needs may not be the altruism that it pretends to be but may mask our concerted efforts to make that students response or achievement testify to our own competence. Maxine Greene (Teacher as Stranger) calls this kind of false altruism "malefic generosity."

T-3: I wonder now if the perplexed look on your face when I said I offered to tutor a student ties in here? I don't honestly think so. My response was more an act of rebellion to a directive from another source that insinuated that because she was leaving the school we had only minimal responsibility in that direction.

"The other side of the coin" represents the critical perspective of the supervisor, whose function is to provide alternative ways of viewing situation. While academic freedom is generally acknowledged as a cherished and fundamental principle of education, its presence in concrete situations is tied to issues of interpersonal dominance and complicity. Receiving freedom and giving it are actions that are more complex and problematic than the reciprocity of their theoretical correspondence would suggest.

The facilitation theme is extended into this examination of ways

in which a teacher may co-opt the challenge of a resistant or hostile student by exerting increased influence to draw the student in. JW identifies this response in her own work as a compensatory gesture, designed to relieve her own guilt rather than to satisfy the student's needs.

T-3 evinces another aspect of the ways in which the writings complement the observations and conferences of supervision, for it offers a channel of communication for thoughts that linger unsaid, in the minds of teachers and supervisors. Our conversations have a history and a future that transcend the temporal and interpretive limits of our face-to-face verbal encounters. They are rooted in our expectations and extend into our afterthoughts where we find the eloquence, understanding and doubt that are often precluded by the immediacy of verbal interchange. The correspondence permits both teacher and supervisor to re-cycle, and thus re-interpret each other's meanings.

***

T-1: Through the on-going staff development program nationally, I found myself in group courses/seminars/job training courses run by people, many of whom lacked any kind of teaching skill, to say nothing of their deficiency in dealing with human relations/group dynamics. I remember vividly to this day a job training course in administration/supervision where I, at 25, was the youngest participant by 30 years. I found myself in the frustrating situation of being "put down", not on the merit of what I said, but rather on the basis of "too young to know". Instinct told me to just keep my mouth shut and ride it through, but the trainers were old acquaintances and I was constantly called on for answers/opinions; then put down by the group for each response. I can't remember one point we agreed on. I went home after 10 days of this badly shaken and unsure of myself even though I knew the material and could implement it. Since then I've wondered, though it never occurred to me at the time, why I didn't

just parrot the group response rather than feeling the need to be honest to that extent. I guess perhaps I was appalled by the rigidity of thought and the "one way" of doing things.

S-1: Could it be that you were resisting the insidious pressure of group dynamics to spout a party line?

T-2: Very possibly you're correct. My perverse streak turns up frequently.

This account of JW's experience in a scout organization had bearing upon her response to her teaching situation as well, for it echoed her concern about asserting her opinions in communication with other faculty members.

In addition, by indicating the degree to which she felt discredited even though she "knew the material" it suggests that she may be projecting her own sense of vulnerability on to her students and that the facilitative posture is a defense against her own aggression. While I never offered this interpretation, it was confirmed in JW's later writings as the focus shifted from facilitation to the ways in which she could most effectively assert her own opinions and views in communication with students, other faculty members and in making decisions about her own career as well.

***

T-1: A constant source of learning for the past 10 years has been through my affiliation with a volunteer ambulance corp. It proves an interesting project keeping training current and at a high level and enforcing participation of all without losing volunteers. Along with this we encourage as professional a level of competence as possible. I see the strongest learning not only in the area of content of material taught, adapting techniques to be used; but also in the area of personnel relationships...This is made especially interesting because of the background and educational diversity of membership including Ph D's, housewives, construction workers, nurses and students, factory workers, teachers and many more.

S-1: Is there any way that that model can be transferred to your

work with the students?

T-2: Not directly I guess. Diversity of backgrounds also in students/floor staff, contributes to unrest. The same kind of resentment from the floor staff toward educated students/ instructor if one isn't careful.

S-2: And it must be significant that the ambulance corps people are not in there to secure a degree or a job. Why do people volunteer for this work? What are the incentives for individual participation and group affiliation?

T-3: The ambulance and why volunteer, incentives for individual participation and group affiliation. I can now give my reasons, and I believe that they are similar for many. Initially, 10 years ago, it provided an out from the Susie Homemaker role. It was a place I could take the kids with me and they had friends, and a place to play there also. It was warm/caring in those days - a secure place, small with 1 rig/limited equipment and very close knit. I sort of wrapped in it - enjoyed the warmth/the challenges/the fun times. However, the small grows, progress it's called. We now have 3 rigs and a cardiac unit, and it's big business with complex training/equipment. Many good old members couldn't or wouldn't put in the time/effort to grow and so they are no longer there. We have more members, better training, a crack corp -- and much less dedication.

The open-ended assignment of the first piece, the essay on "educational experience" permits the inclusion of situations that extend beyond the classroom. This variety of contexts provides a background against which the teaching situation can be examined and criticized, thus emphasizing the understanding that situation is something that we not only find but do. As JW discussed the warmth and cooperation of the ambulance corps, or the bureaucratization of the scout organization, these settings became backdrops against which certain features of the teaching situation were highlighted. Their prescence endows the conventions of the teaching situation with the semblance of artifice that they rightly possess but lose as we who live within them forget that we have made them and confuse them with the natural order.

***

T-1: I entered the nursing field and found myself in a battle to succeed in a very competitive program. The attitude appeared to be "work or get out, there are 10 to take your place". I wasn't honestly prepared for this pressure -- the length of reading assignments/the type of testing/the pressure in the clinical area. I remember the first time I did a dressing change for a clinical instructor. I knew intellectually how to do it step by step. I realize looking back on it the instructor was actually very nice to me. But, at the time she seemed brusque, scowling, clipped in speech and I was in absolute panic. My mouth was like cotton and the perspiration ran down my arms and soaked my hands in my gloves.

S-1: What a fantastic description of that kind of terror.

My responses were not always inquisitive and I occasionally responded merely to indicate my pleasure in the prose. While the praise may have been welcome, it rarely stimulated further response from the teacher. I purposefully limited this kind of response not only because it served to bring the dialogue to a dead stop, but also because it tends to patronize the writer, reducing her insights to a performance directed to elicit another's approval.

***

S-2: You write beautifully and it has been a pleasure to share this. Thank you. I'm still pretty interested in your further definition of the facilitator role in the light of other comments concerning your own response to challenges and disagreements. Is that an issue that interests you, that you would want to go into further? What kind of work do you see yourself doing when the school closes? We can talk about some of these points on Wednesday, if you have the time. I suspect that once I have a chance to see you in this setting I may have a lot more questions.

By questioning JW's plans for the future, I am introducing another dimension into her response to her current situation, for its meaning is influenced by her expectations as well as by her past experience. At this point in her teaching career, JW faced a choice between taking another teaching position or returning to school in order to gain the credentials that would permit her to assume a more influential role in

nursing education. The themes of self-assertion, competition and anxiety that emerged in the descriptions of her past experience penetrated this choice concerning her future as well, and dominated, to a large degree, the way in which she perceived her current teaching situation.

My final comments are designed to invite further dialogue without compelling it. As the material indicates, JW did chose to delve further into these issues, but in many other cases, the topics that surface during the observations and conferences introduce other, more salient themes. This initial dialogue provides the ground on which we meet and from it I find a path of entry to the teaching situation that I then observe. By permitting each of us, teacher and supervisor, to articulate our own perspectives, this dialogue penetrates the crust of complexity and contingency that encases the teaching situation making what has once appeared opaque and inflexible, open to our understanding and action.

The Observer's Questions

The autobiographical process may be extended throughout the supervisory period, but does not preclude the supervisor's observations of the classroom milieu. Those observations may employ the pattern recognition recommended by Cogan or even the use of videotaping or IA schemes if those devices promise to provide some answers to the questions that the teacher is asking of her work.

The letter that follows is one that I sent to JW after observing her work with the students on the ward and after observing her lead a "post-conference" with these students at the end of the day.

Dear J:

I'm writing to review the main points of our discussion following

Wednesday's post-conference. This memo can't even attempt to capture all that we discussed that afternoon. I trust that you will fill in the spaces and round some of the rough corners of this summary.

My question, and perhaps, yours seems to be - how can you direct the discussion and analysis of the day's events without squelching the cathartic value of the bubbling chatter that the girls need, are entitled to, and enjoy?

Some of the forms for greater participation on your part seem to be:

1) Drawing out an explicit statement from a speaker before she is interrupted by the others.
2) Stepping in to draw out the meaning of a phrase used carelessly during conversation, (i.e. "she's doing it for attention" - examining why that phrase is used to denigrate the behavior it describes.)
3) Focussing questions more specifically, especially questions about their own responses (switching from "does it raise your anxiety level" to "how did you know you were anxious? What in your own behavior manifested your anxiety? How did you diminish the anxiety you experienced? How did you mask your anxiety?)
4) Drawing out the group when one student's statement provides a way of thinking about the experience that may be useful for them all. A short writing exercise can be used in this kind of inquiry to allow each individual to focus on her own response before submitting it to the group. For example, one student's fantasy about which patients would come to her aid if she were attacked can be developed into an exercise where everyone writes down the name of the patient she would look to in similar circumstances. A similar approach could be used to zoom in on the "only getting attention" issue, asking each student to list the actions that she has taken during that day to get attention herself.
5) By jotting down some notes you may be able to perceive the thematic threads that run through the apparently random discussion. In that conference the issue of appropriate facilities and the transfer of patients surfaced three times - J's switch from 6 to 5, M's impending move to Willard, R's to a home in the community. You may not want to discuss the theme <u>per se</u>, until the latter part of the conference where you may want to raise the issues that are common to all three events (including the students' resistance to relinquish the care of their clients to someone else.) That kind of summary may also permit you to make an explicit connection between their daily experience and observations and the prescribed objectives for the course.
6) Actively soliciting responses that run counter to the usual agenda. For instance, in addition to asking the students to consider all that has become easier for them since they have been on the service, you might also ask them to talk about what has

become more difficult for them as well.

In reference to work on the floor, you may want to think about initial presentations that may be more explicitly reassuring or draw from the students' their own perceptions of their vulnerability and the steps that they can take to protect themselves. It may also be useful to explain the effort you make to blunt your own affect with patients in order to diminish your own interaction with them and facilitate the students' contact with them.

Another suggestion concerns the anecdotal notes. So long as you have identified the students' own responses to this work as a major focus for them on the floor it may make sense to have the goal for each day's work to be stated from the student's own perspective as well as her objectives concerning the patient.

I continue to be intrigued with the idea of using physical warm-ups and gesture exercises with the students when they are in this service with you both to help them relax and to heighten their tolerance for unconventional gestures and movements and to acknowledge their responses to them.

Well, all this barely grazes the surface. Please excuse its brevity and over-simplifications. One amazing aspect of working with you in this setting is that I was so involved in what was going on around me that even though I was an observer, my comments seemed to come from some level of shared experience rather than a very distant, dispassionate view. I look forward to seeing you Thursday. Try to let go of it all, til then. It won't go away and you may enjoy the respite.

Yours,
Madeleine

Our correspondence continued after this visit, providing JW to report on her use of my suggestions, discriminating those that were useful from those that were not.

T-1: Dual Anecdotals:* Enclosed some of the better ones. Many dealt with simply: "I want to improve my communications". Though it gave nothing per se, it was a beautiful lead in to how will you do this, and on and on as they spent time

*Anecdotals were notes kept by the student describing the goals for their patients in the course of the day's activities. I had suggested that the students make note of the goals of their own activities as well - hence <u>dual</u> anecdotals.

conversing with friends on the floor. Even the less creatively thought out ones, sometimes gave something as a lead to pursue.

S-1: And that fascinates me - in this process - how even nothing is a springboard.

T-2: Me too! And the tremendous strength of the negative as the positive.

T-1: Following are some direct quotes:

"I want to make an effort to sit down and talk with B and try to get rid of some of my fears about her."
"I want to try and relax more so I'll be more able to mingle with patients."
"Main objective today is to improve my communication skill by talking with other patients as well as my own."
"Sit alone in the middle of room for 15 min."
"Seek out M and sit and talk."
"Increase my awareness of what's going on around me."
"Wash KDV's hair."
"Have an interaction with S."
"Try to be objective where patients are concerned."
"Maintain strong limits with M so she can't manipulate me."
"Try and "loosen" up at the dance. The first one had everyone pretty nervous."

S-1: Did you find any relation between the specificity of these comments and these students' clinical effectiveness?

T-2: To a high degree. Those that could be specific in direction were more goal oriented and though process was sometimes hard for them to pull out alone, they seemed better able to handle that with help once the goal was isolated. Dealing with such as demonstrated in #4 was a never ending operation trying to isolate specifics from vague phantom generalities. I rather made the judgmental correlation that the generalists were too constricted for whatever reason to deal with specifics, to ever hone in on one idea.

S-2: I'm interested in how many of these remarks refer to physical experience, position, gesture.

T-3: Agreed, and they had no help with that. I was tremendously excited about your suggestion of gesture and physical activity prior to floor, but I just couldn't handle it. It's an area of extreme discomfort for me. I've gone way back and then forward and frozen between high school and college. I can't isolate the factors yet. Your idea on last meeting of persistence is probably good, but I just can't handle the gesture aspect at all. Played with this to a degree when I decided some of the group was responding negatively to my

gestures in post-conference. Tried using a mirror and ended up embarrassing myself.

T-1: I really do believe that my openness with myself allowed me openness with them. I thought I was case hardened to student anger and antagonism and I soon realized that in this block I wasn't any longer -- and to a point cursed the fact and in the same breath praised it. If one can handle the vulnerability of this, the perceptions are so much stronger.

S-1: That seems crucial to me - would you speculate as to why? Was it merely naming and distancing or a self-tolerance then extended to others?

T-2: Naming and distancing is superficial and wouldn't really do it, I don't believe. When I see myself and understand my response it allows me to adapt this response to a less biased one in some instances. I may have to distance to do this on occasion. If I can bring their sphere into relation with my sphere, I can deal with more strength more understanding and more openness. Perhaps I can give an example. I discovered that student action that aroused in me the greatest desire to antagonistic response, was frequently that action I could attribute to self in the past and didn't like, or was reminiscent of someone else I didn't like.

The Participant's Questions

If the autobiographical method were to halt with these initial pieces, then classroom observations might be reduced to mere identifications and demonstrations of the issues developed in the autobiographical dialogue. It is important that a journal process start at this point, repeating the close and distant scanning of experience that the essays required. In the journal the teachers are not necessarily reviewing their own educational histories, but are recording their responses to the work that they have done each day. The journal entries are most fertile when they are immediate, even fragmentary, records of the teacher's response. Once a week the teacher is asked to review these entries, to look at them analytically in order to discover what they are about. The supervisor participates less fully in the journal

process. Having started upon this path of critical reflection with the teacher, the supervisor travels a way and then peels off, permitting the teacher to sustain the dialectic on his own.

Again, I have chosen those entries which specifically address the themes of assertiveness and student autonomy that were drawn through this teacher's initial writings about educational experience. In this phase of the reflexive process, I withdrew as an active respondent, reading the journals only to monitor the balance of immediate, associative writings and distanced reflection.

JW - Journals

3/21 What a challenge this group will be/all anxiety out of sight and one who quit nursing before because of psych. experience. What an orientation from my point of view - I still don't know what happened - I just couldn't sit any longer quietly - first to expound on the fantastic opportunity psych. gives them to deal with concept/self awareness/communication - really said it as I feel it - response interesting - students vague - if anyone was with me, it wasn't obvious - LS favored me with one of her indulgent mother looks, and BM proceeded as usual to summarize my thoughts/words for me and as usual I didn't hear anything related to my initial verbalization. I think you could drive someone crazy this way - subtly. But even that was not enough - I had to open my mouth again - child was so frightened/so curled within herself - yet she named it "fear". She deserved more than the casual platitudes she was getting - to make it worse, she wasn't even one of my students. If they thought I was weird before - they know it now. Felt kind of good. Oh I didn't stop there - I won my battle to handle the diaries/anecdotals my own way with my group - what disruption that's causing! Must have gotten me in the mood because when one of the kids ask how long my coat tails were I gave them the whole security pitch that I knew I couldn't say - I've stewed on that for a week also! All in all it was quite a day - more touching - terribly tense students... and through it all I felt extremely good/calm/secure/comfortable. Not all positive, however. I'm really not sure that my gain is worth the disruption to others. I really am not sure! Significant that she couldn't remember my name to introduce me, and when she did, she called me 2x by name of her anxiety produce of last year? Still rumblings in other directions; why am I dragging my heels about job? I should be joyous at the potential!
3/22 What a bittersweet day. Pleased with D. and her "keep trying"

attitude. Our rapport seems to be quite good already. She has good support from friends at home. I can lead and she'll follow - There's some strength there. She did well - freely with grey ladies and thinks she'll choose CS. I set that up. Guess I'll know soon if that's very wise. So angry this a.m. When K expounded on her feelings - hateful/uncaring/inhumane/arrogant I struggled with my own emotions but think I carried it off. She's hurting badly - it has to be me first at this point I guess, but she will fail if the attitude doesn't change. It's bothered me all day and probably will all night. The solicitous attitude - do all the right moves - even with AB always watching - waiting for approval...and I will not reward that empty act. This isn't med. surg., I will not reward a mechanical process. Need to talk to E. - She should have more background for me. Rest of crew still hanging in. Shock them when AB and I did musical chairs - They seemed amazed/then amused - that puzzles me too! A couple still clinging - reaching out to touch - first group that had done that - this I understand! Peculiar reaction from B's group. They stare and stare - makes me immensely uncomfortable. I'm so tired tonight. Three more job potentials today - Laverne surprised me telling me to apply there - When I reminded him they aren't hiring he said "we hire when we want to." All he ever does is hassle us - I won't deal with this now - can't seem to handle decisions in this line at this point - perhaps tomorrow. 3/23 What a group - who promised them a rose garden? They're so involved with their own feelings! How to open their eyes to what's around them - how to get them to see/to feel the misery - just some emotionalism--how can they look at this without feeling something! I want to shake them - The anxiety shows in inappropriate laughter - patients think it's at them...I feel like I'm running in circles holding every one together and doing nothing for anyone. D is the one bright spot - through all the anxiety, the hangups - she's still trying - I do believe some day she'll see she cares. Post-conference - where the hell do they get off watching their watches all the time - so obviously no less. If they want it rough - rough it will be - I don't have to take this crap. If they think I'm going to sit and lecture to them, they're dead wrong - but how to turn them around - rough/gentle? They misread gentleness for weakness, but if I stomp will I lose them? And the dance - the insolence - "if you don't dance, why should we." They make me so angry I ache. I can't think about them anymore - I'm just too tired. How long has it been since I've needed a nap after work in order to get through dinner - every blasted day this week! I'll see if I can't work something out over the weekend when I've had time and distance!

Long View

Somehow I'm changing - more open and in some ways more comfortable - Or I would be with most groups! High anxiety on students - two with major problems. Inability to deal with patients - or try. Rude and insulting in their dealings with me. Non-communicative in conference. Job potentials and my future causing additional

disruption! Must deal with myself before I can deal with them. 3/28 What a way to start the day - Those darn students simply refuse to follow directions - They were told to park in the parking lot Thurs/Friday and today again they're on Azalea St. - Anger/Hostility! How to deal with group - they're attempting to intimidate me - I'll probably blow the whole thing - told them I wasn't going to argue - get out there and move them. Early termination and my anger about that doesn't help - or my unrest about next year. These kids are so angry/resentful - why? They come with a chip on their shoulder, just daring us to knock it off - perhaps related to the bad time they've had with parking at Genesee. Poor day on floor with few bright spots - talking to each other - all selected their patients today with some strong direction from me. I've never had a group so unwilling to try. I'm tired dragging them from patient to patient. Tommorrow, I better see more initiative! K and I had a chat about journal that wasn't turned in and who she could possibly choose as a patient. I almost had eye contact with her a couple times. I'm going to pursue this easy pace with her for a bit and see if I can get a rapport established. Floor relatively quiet, but students "felt all the tension." I hope it stays quiet till they settle in. Post-conference better than expected. They weren't going to talk so I called by name 1x1 - listened/questioned and when someone started to wander I called on them immediately. No one looked at watches all conference. It was far more directed than I would choose - but they just do not choose to talk. B. wants us to assign post-conference objectives to students - I see that as a last resort.
4/4 How does not teach compassion? Or is it there so deeply coated by self concern that I can't reach it? Perhaps I've been too gentle with them. Maybe they need to struggle a bit more to make it their own - except pattern to date has been withdrawal. I'm so directive on F. damn disruptive - sending students here and there to do things for and with patients. They read charts today and were ready to give up- I am too - on them. Any concern is intellectual - define and differentiate hallucination/delusion...but unresponsive to seeing it firsthand. They'd love psych. in a nice protected little box. Talk wishfully of BF. I've given more of me to this group in 2 weeks than to any other in 8, and I'm still not very far with them in any direction. Conference directed/non-sponteneous/very little group discussion/no disagreement/no arguments/I could tell them it's raining on a sunny day and no one would dispute it - Maybe they wouldn't know the difference. I'm so frustrated, so tired. I take out a pen and they think I'm taking notes on what they're saying though I've explained my purpose. By damn - I'll teach them someway - The impossible just seems to take a little more time. Paper 1 better than I expected except for the superficial excuse K. handed in. Thank God for D. - she may be the one success!
4/5 WOW! What happened!: The post-conference took off - and on a

subject that I saw as a dead issue Rom. Conf. in a.m. Argument/ confrontation with each other - angry/passive - fantastic. K. was relating all the divorce situation stuff to her own experience - plus some I never heard this a.m. Had to be her personal interpretation! I let them go - just expressing views! Those uncomfortable with psych. want it to be a "nervous breakdown" - it's safer - the anger - an "adult temper tantrum". I challenged on both points - gently for fear of their withdrawal. D. argued with me beautifully! B. spoke strongly if quietly...when it was in danger of losing momentum I stopped it - picked up on directions and asked them if they realized what had happened! I felt enthused/ excited - and I let it flow all over them - how pleased I was - did it feel different - how did they (reversed order them than me) feel. 7 conference days and the first time anyone interacted with anyone else. I think they see me as being in need of my own unit. Refused to tell them what form to do paper in. Do their own thing as long as context is complete! Need to think in psych - no one going to give answers - only some direction. God did it feel good. Still disrupted by pen - why? Why today - what got them going? I sure didn't portray much enthusiasm for topic - I'm sure, but I started and when I'd see an expression, I'd nail them - pretty soon it was near chaos. Needed to pull back to get it settled, but it was the first time I knew they could handle it...I just have to teach - The highs are like nothing else. I just can't give it all up. One day like this is worth all the other struggling ones. I need what this gives me.

Finally JW commented at some length on her own use of this method.

T-1: The writing is ever present here again -- I can allow myself vulnerability with what I know/understand and feel sure of -- I can't chance it dealing from insecurity. I used my writing differently this block - the journal fed the longer pieces - (ones dealing with things we weren't pursuing also) - if from no other direction than causing the incessant "why" in response to an emotional feeling from journal - example as best I can: K. striking out at the world and unrelated people for deep hurts led into thoughts of my own and very similar responses and I reviewed several almost as intensely as the first time around. Dealing with her was probably hardest of all because I can't deal with some of her problems at this point for myself either. I did gain insight for myself, however, sort of in the reverse process. I found that I reflected on comparatives from flash backs. D. recalling her first psych experience - her words were similar to how I would have initially described the floor of my experience, and some of her fears were mind also. I didn't just write the journal - I referred to it this block and used it.

S-1: I don't want to burden you with questions that are drudgery to answer, but could you be more specific about how and when you referred to the journal and about the use you made of it?

T-2: I may be commenting after the fact as some of the writing is in the first installment of this you already have. One example was the response to journal "I need to teach, I need what it gives me" or something like that. It just came out in the journal, and when I reread the journal it stuck with me, and I know it's fact, and where it's at. I didn't have any option but school because I can't do what I need to do without it. It prompted the initial interview. All the pushing you did couldn't have forced the commited act till I accepted that need. Referred in journal in two separate places to "cold" - first time in relation to PE (you have that in response to one of your questions, last envelope). I later referred to a person as cold, a person I do not even know, have never spoken to, merely seen and heard speak. It was so off the top of my head and judgmental that it bothered me and when I pursued it later, I came to the conclusion that the "cold" was not just temperature. I was also judging this person in that context - associating them by external appearance reminiscent of a past orientation. That's an interesting lesson to be aware of for the future. Most traumatic for me dealt with AB. In her delusional state she goes out of control/strips off her clothes/Indian dances and strikes out. She was entering this state one day of G.L. party and when she should have been removed from the stimulation, she was left and I couldn't leave the kids in the room alone with the tenor of the floor and both groups under my wing to take her off myself. She became gross, seductive/provocative in motion/gesture to the pure obscene. I blocked this as I could, but with little success as my attention was in many directions that day. I was overwhelmed by a horrid nauseous feeling usually reserved for only the grossest of road accidents - if then. Students saw her as having a good time, staff saw her without response on their part, so perceptions were different. Only the male student understood. I documented that in the journal - disrupted by the fact that I had dealt with far worse at G-1, really raw stuff without disruption or second thought, why now and why this particular thing? I went back at it, first in journal summary and then in longer writings and finally realized it was the act incongrous with the role I placed AB in - that of a sweet little old lady. I viewed her as she responds with me, not as she is. That's emotion without objectivity and I indulged in it with two patients, AB and MG. I don't use the summary in my own book, if something needs further dealing, I go to the longer pieces and play it out.

As to the longer pieces, I see the writing as less constricted, the depth of thought available much greater (if one will allow it the time) than the other voices. For me the thought patterns were far more ordered/more purposeful. Most of the writing was the project of several to many scribble copies, notes; especially when dealing with things I couldn't reach right away -- at times evolved into a thought association type thing. I could not randomly talk about this because a great deal of understanding wasn't available/self-consciousness would also have blocked thought in some circumstances. The first thought proved through writing to not always be the correct interpretation - i.e. my rapid verbal interpretation regarding vocabulary response to your initial presentation. Only right aspect was that there was feeling dealing with vocabulary - never realized till later - why. It's still more searching than the journal voice. I see them as three distinct entities - complementing, but not replacing each other. I think one needs the three for verification, clarification if you will. To some extent after the initial writing, the verbalization many times instituted thought process, my journal writing - both the one you collected and my other, patterned it - sometimes with emotion, other times camouflaged within another subject, and the long pieces dealt with it far more objectively. Time I perceive as a major factor in this, (and I was not constrained by this limitation,) and perhaps need - call it motivation. It has proven an extremely useful tool. I find myself intrigued more and more with the process. I thought I knew myself, but I'm finding there is much almost patterned response, reason for which I could not document, that's been disruptive and non-productive and led to less than best response. Pieces are still falling in place - 3 more areas recently opened up as response to #9, and I can document cause of behaviors/response over many years standing. How much luck one has in affecting change at this point, I really don't know, but awareness has got to be a first step. So consistently, Madeleine, your response to my writing has touched on an area I had freshly pursued to greater depth, or provoked an area of exploration that proved fruitful.

Post-conference was one of the places where there was the greatest change. This group could not have responded at all with the facilitator role. To go anywhere, any time needed direction - strong leadership/control of the group. I found myself doing much more confronting than ever before - not allowing them to get away with comments I had strong feelings about, or comments I felt were only parroting what they thought I wanted them to say -- and with this all my prior feelings of threatening went out the window. I observed 2 of us say the same words and 1 threatened and 1 didn't - it's the way of saying perhaps more than the content that

threatens. Had trouble all block with post-conferences - but would have had more if I had not been directive. This elicited response from some students that don't usually contribute because I kept at them. One example was a post-conference re: acting out behavior. They were ready to accept dangerous acting out behavior as childish temper tantrums. I confronted 1 by 1 a great deal that day - turning their ridiculous comments back at them or at someone else, and we evolved to the idea that they saw it as normal temper tantrums because they themselves "act out" - throw chairs at husbands, punch parents, and all this type of thing. I still kept at them as to how they viewed this. They were, for the most part, unable to distance and be objective. I left it with a few things for them to think about, picked up individually in conferences and then went back at it later & post-conference. At this point there seemed to be a bit more insight from 2 or 3, but no more. Individual conferences were better too. I constantly challenged them - "what if", "how would you feel if" - conferences averaged no less than 45 minutes and seemed still stronger than before. Where sometimes before the kids were anxious for conference to end - I almost always had to terminate these the last three weeks. I saw more depth here than anywhere else, and that was important as so little surfaced with most at all. I was also more directive in making decisions for operation of my clinical group as a unique entity - not needing to be half of a whole - but rather the whole itself. I did things with my group and dealt with my group in my own way, and when I was told I couldn't, I circumvented one way or another and did my thing. I was never so good at this before, and with little if any of the guilt I've accepted before for my diverse activities. Here was a good share of the problem - I'm not good at following someone else's directions when I don't agree, and I put myself in the follower role when I should have led, or led subversively, when I should have done it outright and openly and others be damned. I more or less did this the last half of the block openly - great for me, bad for others.

Just as supervision that is alien to the teacher's own experience is burdened with the hostility and defensiveness that Blumberg and Cogan have described, supervision that employs the method presented here presents its own risks. The intimacy that it offers to the teacher and the supervisor is seductive, and dangerous to the teacher if their dialogue is absorbed into the bonds of their personal

friendship. We use our friends and, are, in turn used by them. It is too easy to permit the teacher to substitute the shelter of our living rooms for the situation that this correspondence addresses - the classroom. And it not only the affiliative needs of the teacher that are served by this substitution. Supervisors also dwell in barren living rooms and must guard against the hospitality that would reduce the teacher to an object of their own loneliness. It is incumbent upon the supervisor then to monitor her own investment in the relationship that she develops with the teachers with whom she works in this manner, examining with rigor, whose interests are being served. It is in this regard that those engaged in this kind of supervision can be helpful to each other, and I found my contact with my colleague, Joan Stone, who shared this work, most helpful.

Finally, it is not the relationship of the teacher to the supervisor that is the goal of supervision. Supervision merely serves to help the teacher to become a student of her own work and to assume a dialectical relation to that work, "a dialog in which the questioner and the questioned constantly appear to each other in a different light." (Streeter, 1967, p. 508)

NOTES

1. These schemes lead us away from the classroom to the ever larger and more comprehensive social structures in which it is embedded. They might just as well extend in the opposite direction, moving from the classroom to the family, the roles and interests of parents, siblings, kin, their ethnic traditions, etc.

2. This assertion is supported by Dale Mann's research (1976) which suggests that unless teachers participate in the conception and planning of a particular innovation and "reinvent the wheel" in that process, they will not adapt that innovation to their daily classroom work.

I wish to acknowledge the suggestions of Professor Eleanor Larson, Center for Curriculum and Instruction, College of Education, The University of Rochester, and particularly the assistance and criticism of my colleague, Professor Joan Stone, Rochester Technical Institute for the Deaf. I am especially grateful to the teacher whose work is reported in this paper. Her energy and commitment to teaching are revealed in her writings and her generosity is expressed in her willingness to let me present her work as a demonstration of this method.

Bernstein, B. Class Codes and Control, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Blumberg, A. Supervision and Teachers, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp. 1974.

Bowers, K. "Situationism in Psychology: An Analysis and a Critique" Psychological Review, 1973 (September) 80 (5) 307-336.

Cicourel, A. "Some Basic Theoretical Issues in the Assessment of the Child's Performance in Testing and Classroom Settings" in A. Cicourel, K. Jennings, S. Jennings, K. Leiter, R. Mackay, H. Mehan and D. Roth (Eds.), Language Use and School Performance, New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Cogan, M. Clinical Supervision, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Doyle, W. "Paradigms for Research on Teacher Effectiveness" in L. Shulman (Ed.) Review of Research in Education, Vol. 5 Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1978.

Goldhammer, R. Clinical Supervision: Special Methods for the Supervision of Teachers, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Greene, M. "Malefic Generosity". Paper presented to the Critical Theory Conference, Department of Social Foundations, Faculty of Educational Studies, State University of New York at Buffalo. Spring 1976.

Grumet, M. "Songs and Situation: The Figure/Ground Relation in a Case Study of Currere." in Qualitative Evaluation G. Willis (Ed.) Berkeley: McCutchan 1978.

Kwant, R. The Phenomenological Philosophy of Merleau-Ponty, Pittsburg: Duquesne University Press, 1963.

Lewis A. and A. Miel, Supervision for Improved Instruction, Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing, 1972.

Litwak, E., E. Shiroi, L. Zimmerman, J. Bernstein "Community Participation in Bureaucratic Organizations: Principles and Strategies" Interchange Vol. 1. No. 4. 1970.

Mann, D. "Making Change Happen?" Teacher's College Record, Vol. 77. No. 3. 1976.

Merleau-Ponty, M. The Phenomenology of Perception, C. Wilson (Trans.) New York: Humanities Press, 1962.

Oliver, D. Education and Community, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp. 1976.

Pinar, W. and M. Grumet Toward a Poor Curriculum, Dubuque: Kendall Hunt, 1976.

Schwab, J. "The Practical: A Language for Curriculum" in D. Purpel and M. Belanger (Eds.) Curriculum and the Cultural Revolution, Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co. 1972.

Sergiovanni, T.J. and R. J. Starratt, Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives, New York: McGraw Hill, 1971.

Streeter, S. "Phenomenology and the Human Sciences" in J. Kocklemans (Ed.) Phenomenology New York: Doubleday and Co. 1967.